The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1921 No. 2914

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 677

EDITORIALS:
- The Final German Opportunity 680
- No War with England. IV. The Menace of Naval Competition 681
- The *Manchester Guardian* 682
- The Undesirable Sales Tax 683

THE NEW EDUCATION. II. The Modern School. By Evelyn Dewey 684

FRANCE'S SECOND VERDUN. By Lewis S. Gannett 686

A FOOTNOTE TO EGYPTIAN HISTORY. By Hiram K. Moderwell 688

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 690

CORRESPONDENCE 690

BOOKS:
- The Suicidity of Suicide. By Robert Herrick 691
- Count Witte. By William MacDonald 692
- Fashions. By Mark Van Doren 693
- Kansas 693
- Upper Silesia 694
- Books in Brief 694

DRAMA:
- "Liliom." By Ludwig Lewisohn 695

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:
- Russia's Treaties with Persia and Afghanistan 696

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

LEWIS S. GANNETT FREDA KIRCHWEY
ARTHUR WARNER LUDWIG LEWISOHN

ERNEST H. GRUENING, MANAGING EDITOR
CARL VAN DOREN, LITERARY EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agent for Subscriptions and Advertising: Ernest Thurtle, 36 Temple, Fortune Hill, N. W. 4, England.

THE *Nation* takes pleasure in announcing the addition to its staff of the following contributing editors: Prof. Robert Herrick, of the University of Chicago; H. L. Mencken, of Baltimore; John A. Hobson, of London, and Prof. Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster, now of Zürich. It feels certain that the counsel and the contributions of these gentlemen will add much to its usefulness, and it proposes to increase the board, notably on the Continent, to obtain a still wider range of interest. The distinguished American members of the new board need no characterization to our readers, who are also familiar with Mr. Hobson's writings; his vision and his profound knowledge of economic problems render his accession to the staff most welcome. Professor Foerster opposed the militarists in Germany from the beginning of the war. He paid a high price for his refusal to go with his country, but his soul is untarnished, his head high, and his life dedicated to good-will among all peoples.

AT the one hundred and second anniversary of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, President Harding told the assembled "boys" how, at a lodge meeting, he had found himself sitting next to his own "shofer." Business of mutual surprise. "Ever after," said the President, "he was a better chauffeur and I was a better employer." The twofold moral adorning this tale is clear. A better boss for being a lodge brother, Warren G. Harding should surely make a grand President. Is he not a Mason, a Shriner, an Odd Fellow, and for all we know, an Elk, Owl, Eagle, Moose, Red Man, and Knight of Pythias? For all his lodge brothers he becomes a better President. But how about those benighted outsiders to whom he does not belong? The Knights of Columbus and the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith should promptly forward their application blanks to the White House. As for the residuum of non-joiners, they should take steps to secure the maximum of service out of their chief Executive, by electing him immediately High Cockalorum of the B.U.N.C.O.M.B.E.—the Benevolent Unassociated Non-Conformers of Mentality Beyond Elevation.

YOU live and breathe the spirit of this Republic. The United States does not want anything on earth that does not rightfully belong to us, no territories, no payment of tribute. But we do want that which is righteously our own, and by the Eternal we mean to have it! You of the navy are the first line of defense. I wish you might never be compelled to fire a gun in war, and I believe that if all the governments on earth were impelled by the same motives as our own is, this world would be at peace forever starting with today. But I would not want peace without honor. I would not want peace without the consciousness that America is doing right, and is protecting its citizenship in the most effective way.

Thus President Harding to the officers of the North Atlantic Fleet, thus Kaiser Wilhelm at Kiel on many a similar occasion, thus Premier Briand every day to Germany, and thus every imperialistic ruler at all times. Mr. Hughes says it is right for our oil men to have a chance at business wherever there is oil, and by the Eternal we mean to have it. A foothold in Yap, a share in all the good things under all the mandates is also our right, and by the Eternal we mean to have it. Of course, if every country had motives as pure, noble, and inspiring as our own we should not have to mean to have it. But, alas! Every other country wishes it could raise the rest of the world to its own standard of morality, its purity, its nobility, its Kultur, and its altruism so as to be safe from attack and sure of what is righteously its own. By the Eternal, now we come to think of it, the Germans, too, were certain they were fighting for nothing else all the time. Was not their place in the sun theirs righteously? Alas, the world, it appears, and President Harding certainly, has learned nothing from the war. The same old lying phrases which drove peoples into the catastrophe still do service, still fall from the lips of those intrusted with power.

THE House of Representatives is debating, at this writing, whether we should have an army of 175,000 men, as the Secretary of War recommends, or of 150,000, as saner counselors are advising. Economy is the chief argument working toward reduction. It is not the highest reason, but in the present state of public opinion it is the most effective. Since the House has just voted the huge sum of $396,000,000 as one year's expenses for the navy (rejecting amendments calling upon the President to initiate a conference on disarmament), it behooves it to scrutinize so much more closely the army appropriation. In this connection it is worth while to turn to the statement that the Secretary of the Treasury has sent to the House Ways and Means Committee. For the first three-quarters of the present fiscal year, he says, the national expenses have been $3,783,771,996, or at the rate of five billions for the year. Of the expenses so far $850,000,000 have gone to the War

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Department and $500,000,000 to the navy. That is to say, $1,350,000,000, or more than a third of our total expenditure, has gone into the upkeep of our present fighting machines. This, of course, takes no account of expenses for pensions or previous wars. (The total war costs for the fiscal year 1920 were 92 per cent of our expenditure.) It is this enormous burden, keeping up, as it does, the cost of living, that we ought to attack—not fair wages to the workers.

SECRETARY MELLON'S proposals for the readjustment of the tax situation are notable because of his unqualified assertion that "the nation cannot continue to spend at this shocking rate" and that the "burden is unbearable," and because of his opposition to the sales tax. With that obnoxious proposal, certain to shift the burden of taxation from the rich and powerful to the weak and the poor, we deal at length elsewhere in this issue. Secretary Mellon's opposition should happily prevent any action on that proposal by Congress. That body will, however, be less inclined to accept his recommendations that the income-tax be readjusted to a combined maximum for normal and surtax of 40 per cent for the tax year 1921 and of 33 per cent thereafter—it is now 73 per cent. Mr. Mellon explains that this recommendation is not due to any desire to relieve the rich but because he is certain that the higher surtaxes have already passed the collection-point and that the Government would actually obtain a greater revenue if the tax were lowered. This may well be; from our point of view, however, nothing should be done just now to change the income-tax. With the excess-profits tax it is different. Originally meant to be a war-profits tax, it undeniably today works injustice and hampers business. But, while agreeing with the Secretary that the so-called minor nuisance taxes, like those on soft drinks, can be omitted, we desire heavy taxation to pay off the war debt, and to bring home to the wealthy, particularly, that they can get relief only by stopping the shocking waste upon army and navy.

BIT by bit the poor decrepit old Treaty of Versailles goes tottering to the grave—now an arm, now a leg, now a hip joint, now an eye tooth. And none so poor to do it reverence! On top of the passage by the Senate, 49 to 23, of the Knox resolution to put an end to the state of war with Germany, it is reported that President Harding has again changed his mind and will not try to save any part of the document of Versailles for the use of the United States. The hope that the League of Nations covenant might be amputated from the body of the Treaty, and the rest preserved, has been abandoned. Senator Lodge says it would take seventy-two amendments to get the League out, and then "nothing but a shell" would remain. So the President is expected to negotiate his own treaty and to submit it to the Senate within a month. So far, so good—provided Mr. Harding does not see another light tomorrow. It is an interesting fact that this decision of Senator Lodge finally to abandon the treaty comes precisely two years and two months after Mr. Wilson boasted that he was going to intertwine the League of Nations Covenant with the Treaty so that they could not be separated. Now comes the fulfillment of the boast, but with just the opposite result from that which Mr. Wilson intended.

NOW it is Holland with which the mad rush for oil is bringing us into contact. It is an interesting story. That country was about to dispose of a concession in the Djambi, Sumatra, oil-fields. Our Standard Oil Company, looking for new worlds to conquer, not only submitted a bid through its Dutch company but succeeded in interesting the State Department to such an extent that it sent a note to the Dutch Government expressing its "great concern" that a monopoly "of such far-reaching importance in the development of oil is about to be bestowed upon a company in which foreign capital other than American is so largely interested." This had no effect whatever on Holland, for the Parliament has adopted the bill giving the concession to a combination formed by the Dutch-Indian Government and the Batavia Oil Company, the latter belonging to the Shell group which is now supposed to be largely controlled by British capital. It was the report that British capital was to get this concession which so aroused our State Department, a fact well worth bearing in mind in connection with recent happenings in Colombia, Costa Rica, and Mexico. In a note to Holland the State Department gave the following explanation of its interest in this matter:

> The United States attaches the highest importance to the recognition of the principle of reciprocity and equal opportunity in the solution of the oil problem, as well as the extension to American capital organized under Dutch law of the same privileges and benefits which are granted to other foreign capital similarly organized under the laws of the Netherlands.

THE foreign trade statistics for March give a graphic illustration of the falling off of the exports of our country. They ought to bring home to the remotest farmer and the smallest trader the stupidity of the attitude of those who believe that we can afford to deal with our economic problems from the purely selfish point of view, disregarding the fate of Europe and putting up further tariff barriers to keep out imports. Even in the highest Republican circles in Washington the lesson of the falling off of exports by 436 millions as compared with March, 1920, ought to have some effect. Fortunately there are signs that the Administration sees that a solution of the European tangle, and notably of the German indemnity question, is very much an American affair and not one in which only Europe is interested. This is the view of so sound a financial expert as Mr. Paul M. Warburg, who has just become chairman of the new International Acceptance Bank. At its opening he stressed the fact that if a reasonable settlement is brought about between the Allies and Germany "gradual revival of trade could be expected, and in that case America would have to play a leading part. With gold flowing our way and with the increasing strength of the Federal Reserve System, it will again be plainly up to the United States not to hoard its vast banking strength, but to make it available for other countries for the purpose of once more starting the wheels of commerce going."

MR. WARBURG declared that American banks can well take upon their shoulders the burden of short-term credits amounting to a billion dollars or more and to that extent relieve Europe, but he is very clear that United States business interests can undertake relief measures on a really comprehensive scale only when political and economic peace has been re-established in Europe. As it is per-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fectly plain that America, if it is to be a financial world power, must develop a system of acceptance and discounting banking houses of the same character and importance as those which have so long existed in London, the establishment of the International Acceptance Bank with so able and constructive a financier as Mr. Warburg in charge becomes a matter of note. Europe is prone to believe that America is not doing her share in solving the world's troubles. We cannot deny that the Government of Mr. Wilson merely marked time after his second return from Paris, but it now looks as if under Mr. Hughes's leadership our political influence will be exercised more energetically and, let us hope, more wisely. But after all, so far as our financial cooperation is concerned, the degree of our helpfulness depends upon France and Great Britain rather than upon ourselves.

OF course, every right-thinking person knows that the present unpleasantness in Ireland, which, by the way, has been greatly exaggerated, is due entirely to a small band of Sinn Fein malcontents who refuse to recognize that Ireland has never been so happy and prosperous as now, and are keeping up a malevolent agitation against His Majesty's troops. These forces are maintaining order in a splendid way and anyone in the United States who doubts it is a Bolshevik, a pro-German, and a Sinn Feiner—all three at once. One has only to read the New York *Times* or the New York *Tribune* or the writings of Mr. John Rathom, the famous editor-confessor, or even the official pronouncements of Sir Auckland Geddes, to be set right about these agitators who are attempting to foment international strife. So it is a bit rough for Lord Charles Parmoor, most respectable of British Tories, to get right up in the House of Lords to ask and secure a resolution calling for an immediate public and impartial inquiry concerning the invasion of the Shannon View Hotel, at Castleconnell, by brave British defenders of the Empire.

BARON Parmoor, according to a special cable dispatch to the New York *World*, read letters from his own brother, an aged surgeon—always loyally British on Irish matters—who had narrowly escaped death in the hotel. He wrote:

> Our landlord, a perfectly innocent, honorable, and much-beloved man, was killed almost before our eyes. My wife and I were held up by revolvers pointed at our breasts. The whole place was shot to pieces by a machine gun brought inside the hotel. It was the most wicked attack you could imagine, and to my horror the perpetrators were Black and Tan auxiliary forces, sixty in number. Over a thousand shots must have been fired, and the auxiliaries behaved like demented red Indians. Of course, we thought it was an attack by Sinn Feiners.

And Lord Parmoor added a charge of graver character. He produced a dumdum bullet which his brother had picked up unexploded. "The bullet," the latter wrote, "had been reversed, thus converting it into an expanding bullet of the most deadly character. Such bullets inflict the most terrible wounds and were prohibited in the late war. It is not suggested," he concluded, "that anyone fired except the government auxiliaries." Every once in a while even a well-bagged cat somehow manages to leap way out. The customary procedure for humane and civilized governments when confronted with the evidence of their misdeeds is to deny that any atrocities have been committed—except, of course, by the other side.

IT has remained for the American Museum of Natural History in New York City to publish to the world the latest and most heinous Bolshevik atrocity. Beside the Museum's stuffed specimen of the European bison a placard proclaims: "Described by Caesar, hunted by Charlemagne, and exterminated by the Bolsheviki." The full story of cruelty and hate is further elaborated by an explanation that the European bison had gradually become reduced in numbers, until at the beginning of the World War there remained only a herd in Lithuania, protected by imperial edict, and a few in the Caucasus Mountains. "During the World War of 1914-1918," says the Museum's historian, "the Lithuanian and Caucasian herds are reported to have been exterminated, partly for food and partly for the sake of killing animals that had been protected by royalty." Curiously enough, the history of the American bison runs counter to this. Our "buffalo" hit it off well enough with our Reds, surviving readily until 100 per cent Americanism arrived on the prairies with gunpowder, a desire for furs, and the doctrine that to kill game for food was sordid while to destroy it for fun was sport. But this man Lenin had better watch his step from now on. He was only annoyed when the chancelleries of Europe took after him, but if our societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals get going, they won't stop until they have chased the chief Sovieteer down the Nevski Prospekt, thrown a net over his head, and packed him off to the Bide-a-Wee Home. Our humane societies, in defense of the European bison, will yet have those Bolsheviki buffaloed.

THAT verse is in itself a hopelessly unpopular form of literature is an error of the sophisticated but imperfectly informed. Every period has its widely read poets. Only these poets rarely rise into the field of criticism, since they always echo the music of day before yesterday and express as an astonishing message the delusions of the huge rear-guard of civilization. The popular poet of our moment in time is Robert W. Service. His publishers announce "another smashing hit." A million copies of his earlier books have been sold. These figures are not greatly exaggerated. We have found his books strapped in with novels of Zane Grey in the satchels of particularly graceless schoolboys and resting on the "parlor" tables of apartments beside dream books and manuals of etiquette. Service sings. One can no more mistake his tunes than those of a hurdy-gurdy. He sings like a Barrack-Room Ballad pricked out on paper and run through a pianola. He is Kipling put up in tins for the home. His substance is red-blooded. He crystallizes the romance of the unintelligent. The anemic clerk dreams of conquering the Yukon. Service does it for him. Now the poet changes his field. Everybody is becoming sophisticated. He goes to what the fashion papers call "gay Paree." Apache, cocotte, grisette—Murger plus water and pathos and wholesomeness. Who can compete with that? Nor are such poets made. They are perfectly sincere and rely proudly on the great heart of humanity to do them justice. Try, moreover, to convince an admirer of Mr. Service of his error. The deepest perceptions are the incommunicable ones. You have them or you must, as Mathew Arnold only half humorously used to say, die in your sins.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Final German Opportunity

GOOD, sound advice Secretary Hughes gave to the German Government in his note of May 2—to lose no time in making "clear, definite and adequate proposals which would in all respects meet its just obligations." The Allies have given Germany an extension of ten days for just this purpose. They should make use of it by publishing promptly their uttermost offer. As we pointed out last week, it was within their right to bargain and haggle over this whole indemnity matter, but it was extremely poor business for them to do so. The dignified and effective thing for them to have done would have been to have presented on March first in London their final proposal in such clear-cut, comprehensive form that every newspaper reader the world over could have read it. This they should have supported, for the Supreme Council's information, with unquestionable facts certified to by neutral economic experts. In handing this plan over to Messrs. Briand and Lloyd George the Germans should have said to them that this was the uttermost they could do and that if these terms were not accepted the Allies must take over the country and govern it themselves. Such a course would have been safe from any misunderstanding and would have at least won the respect of the world.

Instead, even the latest offer, which *The Nation* last week so confidently, but mistakenly, hoped would end the whole indemnity issue, was so confused as to compel the British experts to ask Berlin for elucidations. As the terms appeared here they could not stand expert banking analysis; they did not even make clear whether previous German payments were to be reckoned in or not and they made no reference to the sums due on May 1. In places they merited even the adjective disingenuous—and so once more the German people have been misrepresented by their leaders. Only on one point was the offer clear and specific—in the matter of reparations in the devastated districts, to which, like the previous offers on this subject, the French will, of course, make no reply; the terrible needs of those districts are being subordinated to political opportunism and to chauvinism. Indeed, what makes the attitude of the German leaders so incomprehensible is the fact that they are fully aware that they are dealing with a psychologically abnormal people. The French people were never so much to be pitied as today. Their Government and their press are owned by a group of high financiers, who also own many of their politicians. The trail of selfish politics and more selfish business runs all through the Peace Treaty and the indemnity negotiations. Having roused false hopes and expectations the politicians feel that they must achieve some spectacular results or lose their jobs. Again, there is good ground for the belief that the high financiers, having obtained the Lorraine iron, also insist upon having the Ruhr coal—it is not only where iron is that the Fatherland is to be found!—while there are multitudes of sober French people who really believe that they and their children's children must always live in dread of the coming of another such horror if Germany is not deliberately dismembered and ruined.

So this was the time of all times for the German leaders not to have bluffed or played politics—it seems to us that politics and high finance are wreaking much evil in Berlin as well as in Paris. Ebert, Fehrenbach, and Simons must know that, justly or unjustly, there are enormous masses of people who at present do not trust any German promises; who see in the slow progress of the negotiations only a deliberate German effort to avoid responsibility. The only way to meet that belief was by absolute frankness and straightforwardness. We do not believe that the latest Allied terms are capable of enforcement and we have not changed our opinion that further invasion of Germany will do far more injury to the Allies than to Germany; that it will endanger the whole structure of European civilization, an opinion in which we are fortified by finding ourselves in accord with the finest English spirits and the best of the British press. Were we in charge of the German Government we should certainly not continue to govern if the Allies entered the Ruhr, made a naval demonstration off Hamburg, took over the customs and then destroyed the German export trade by putting on a tax of 25 per cent. That way lies madness, nothing more and nothing less. It spells a slavery which no free men ought to accept, a slavery which will do much more harm to those who impose it than to those who endure it. Hence the Germans should have made their case clear to the world and assumed a "take it or leave it" stand. Their unfortunate inability to understand the psychology of others and to present their case to the world was never more evident.

We hoped last week that Secretary Hughes would be able to prevent the disaster of a further invasion of Germany. On this he seems to have yielded, though friendly in his tone to Berlin and giving it, as we have said, the soundest advice possible. We believe today that he realizes the terrible mistake the French will make from the point of view of their own welfare and that of the world, if they take the extreme measures they propose. Invasion will produce less money for France than abstention. The truth is that we are witnessing another dreadful breakdown of Christianity. Never was there such an opportunity to follow the Golden Rule and the teachings of Jesus, of the Sermon on the Mount. From the very beginning hate and vengeance have dominated the Allies and cruelty as well. They have failed to realize that the war is the greatest failure of force to accomplish anything that the world has ever seen. They are so under the spell of the misery of it all, and so controlled by the vile passions that every war arouses—whether it be avowedly for an ideal or not—that they cannot take the attitude of the Good Samaritan, which would have got more money out of Germany than can all the 75's in the French army. If ever there was a case for applied Christianity, this was it. How can the church be surprised if in consequence its power wanes, and deservedly? *Noblesse oblige*, and nobility ever responds to nobility.

Doubtless, we shall be told that all this is impractical nonsense; that when you are dealing with a lot of conscienceless ruffians like the Germans the only argument is a pistol at the forehead. To that we can only reply that our faith in human nature is as unshaken as our belief in the practicality of the teachings of the Saviour. How anyone can fail to see the impracticality and uselessness of everything that has been done in Europe through force and violence, is beyond us. The proposed policy of the Allies, if the Germans refuse to accept their terms, is simply another long step toward the bottomless abyss into which Europe is drifting under the leadership of the men who now, to its misery, control its destinies.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No War With England

IV. The Menace of Naval Competition

ADMIRAL A. T. MAHAN wrote in "The Influence of Sea Power Upon History" in 1889: "The necessity of a navy, in the restricted sense of the word, springs, therefore, from the existence of peaceful shipping, and disappears with it, except in the case of a nation which has aggressive tendencies, and keeps up a navy merely as a branch of a military establishment. As the United States at present has no aggressive purposes, and as its merchant service has disappeared, the dwindling of the armed fleet and general lack of interest in it are strictly logical consequences. When for any reason sea trade is again found to pay, a large enough shipping interest will reappear to compel the revival of the war fleet." Naval competition is the normal accompaniment of competition in merchant marine. As long as the United Kingdom is dependent on foreign commerce for its sustenance, as long as it is determined to carry this commerce largely in its own ships, as long as the British Empire has dependencies, ports, concessions, and fuel stations to defend on every trade route, and as long as there is any possibility of war, Great Britain will place naval supremacy first among her national policies, and will go to almost any length to maintain it. Likewise, now that the United States has determined to enlarge her foreign commerce and to compete with Britain in the carrying trade, there has been, as Admiral Mahan shrewdly put it, "enough shipping interest to compel the revival of the war fleet."

It was on February 3, 1916, that President Wilson said at St. Louis, "There is no other navy in the world that has to cover so great an area of defense as the American Navy, and it ought, in my judgment, to be incomparably the most adequate navy in the world." The most adequate navy to the largest area must necessarily be the largest navy. And "area of defense" is not a precise phrase. It might mean merely the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of continental United States. But that would not be so large as the coastal and sea area of the British Empire. It might include also Hawaii, and the Philippines, and the Panama Canal. But if we remember the fact that at the time of the speech, over a year before our entry into the war, we were still contesting vigorously with Great Britain as to the rights of our commerce in respect of blockades and seizures, we may infer that in the back of Mr. Wilson's mind "area of defense" had something to do with merchant ships on the Seven Seas. At any rate, the distinction between offense and defense in naval affairs is a meaningless one. It is an established principle of naval strategy that the best defense is an attack, and consequently the largest navy adequate for defense would be capable of a general supremacy. Naval boards of strategy in considering their building programs take into account capabilities rather than existing intentions.

On August 29, 1916, in response to the words of the President, Congress passed a naval appropriation act authorizing, in the words of Secretary Daniels, "a continuous building program comprising 156 war vessels, with 16 capital ships, the largest number ever provided for at any one time by any nation." During the war, in order to concentrate on the anti-submarine campaign, most of our naval building energies went into modern destroyers—of which we now have over 300—and the rest of the program was delayed. Many thought that this enormous program was adopted chiefly for its moral effect on Germany; but now the war is won, and in spite of the fact that Great Britain has authorized no new capital ships, our program is going ahead full speed. The delay enabled us to take into account the lessons of the Battle of Jutland in designing the capital ships. Before 1925, on the basis of the programs at present authorized, we shall have a navy markedly superior to that of Great Britain both in tonnage and in effective fighting strength.*

We shall have twelve battleships of post-Jutland design to Britain's one. We shall have twenty-one battleships of the first line in all, to Britain's eighteen. We shall have six battle cruisers carrying fourteen-inch guns to Britain's four, ours of later design than hers. We shall have 285 destroyers capable of 34 to 36 knots, to England's 193. We shall have 163 modern submarines, 94 of post-war type, to Britain's total of 105 modern subsea boats. Our navy will be inferior only in cruisers for commerce-destroying and other accessory ships. But the three-year program recommended by the General Board last September is chiefly designed to make up this deficiency. Our navy will also be about twice as strong as the Japanese, even if Japan's full projected program is completed. Secretary Denby, giving the Republican indorsement to the policy adopted by the Democrats, says, "I am in favor of a navy equal to the greatest in the world." And, not content with that, Admiral Huse, commandant of the Third Naval District and former member of the Allied Armistice Commission, declares at a dinner of the American Legion that he is in favor of "a navy equal in strength to that of any two navies in the world." Thus we cement the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, by forcing Britain to look for help on the seas.

The Imperial Defense Committee, sitting in secret conclave on the naval policy of the British Empire, is likely to take these facts more seriously into consideration than Admiral Huse's declaration that a war between Great Britain and the United States is "inconceivable." If that be true then what is our need for a two-Power navy? The sober truth, obvious alike to the expert and to the newspaper reader, is that the United States Government appears to have chosen to wrest the supremacy of the seas from Great Britain, and perhaps from Great Britain and her chief ally combined. Yet British tradition of the past three centuries interposes a forcible veto on such an attempt by any nation. No people in all that time has made the attempt without being checked by war. John Lloyd Balderston writes from London to the New York *World*, "To put the matter bluntly, I believe that if the British feel compelled to make the sacrifices involved in a cut-throat naval competition with America, war between the two peoples in the not distant future will be not impossible."

Of course, there remains the chance that naval competition will be alleviated by mutual disarmament. It would be foolish and impossible, say all the authorities, for one nation to cease building before the others do. We should all come to some agreement limiting the size of our navies.

* The new British building program, recently announced, though it does not greatly enlarge the total tonnage of the British navy, will increase its effectiveness not a little.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the meantime, naval opinion seems to favor the building of as large a navy as possible by the United States, in order to be in a favorable position when we come to dicker about the future size of the respective navies, and to enforce on our poorer friends a sense of the folly of pouring so much treasure into dreadnoughts. It is this argument dealing with the enormous expense of the modern navy that is ordinarily cited in favor of armament limitation. Yet, while it would be highly beneficial to the public treasury and the pockets of the taxpayers to limit armaments in this fashion, the argument overlooks the crux of the whole matter in its relation to possible war. "You must bear in mind," said Admiral Huse, "that there is no such thing as a powerful navy, used as an absolute term; the power of the navy is purely a relative term. Suppose all the great nations should agree among themselves to cut down these building programs by one-half or three-quarters or nine-tenths, if you like; the relation of the forces would remain the same as before." So the general intention to reduce navies does not solve the problem of whose navy is to be the largest. We go to a conference on disarmament resolved that our navy shall be as large as Great Britain's, or as Great Britain's and Japan's combined; Great Britain goes to the conference resolved to retain her sea supremacy. Such a conference can lead to nothing, without reconsideration of fundamental national policy. Is Great Britain willing to renounce her control of the seas? Are we willing to allow Great Britain to retain it? Such questions, the imperialists stridently insist, must be answered before disarmament is possible, and they must be answered before long unless the situation is to grow worse rapidly.

A conference capable of solving such problems must go into the whole region of international relationship. Is total disarmament feasible? Or can navies be internationalized through the establishment of some super-government capable of exercising its power impartially? There can be little doubt that the existing governments might answer an unqualified negative to both these questions. On what terms, then, should any nation be allowed to retain naval supremacy? This leads us back to consideration of freedom of the seas, merchant marine and commerce, and forward to considerations of finance, oil, communications and canals, and imperial policy. If the United States is prepared to yield naval supremacy to Great Britain in exchange for concessions in related fields which Great Britain is prepared to grant, there may be another way to avoid a naval competition. A move toward mutual limitation of armaments might possibly lead to a stable agreement on these weighty questions, but when traditionally minded statesmen get to bargaining with threats against commercial advantages, we are in the outer eddies of the whirlpool. Yet how incredible it seems that two such kindred nations should be pouring out treasure to arm against one another because the conventional statesman's mind is so bound up in trade questions and in regard for precedent! What the situation calls for is frank, straightforward world disarmament. If that is not possible, then at least an agreement between Japan, the United States, and England. If that is also not possible, we agree with ex-Secretary Bryan that the United States must take the risk and go it alone; it must set the wise and Christian example of cutting armaments before they bring the great Anglo-Saxon countries to war.*

*The next article in this series will deal with the oil problem as it affects England and the United States.

The *Manchester Guardian*

HUMAN liberty owes much to the North of England, to something solid and uncompromising in the temper of Yorkshire, something cool and clear in the temper of Westmoreland and Cumberland, something level and reasonable in the temper of Lancashire. The *Manchester Guardian*, in being the spokesman of liberal Lancashire for the one hundred years ending May 5 of this year, has contrived with increasing power to be the voice of liberals everywhere. In its early days it outspokenly advocated parliamentary reform against a resistance of established stupidity which can be matched but once or twice in the history of the English; through the middle of the century and onward it held stoutly to Cobden and Bright, supported Gladstone's more enlightened policies, stood from the first for Irish Home Rule, fought imperialism without relaxation—during the Boer War magnificently—and came through the Great War—that acid test of the liberal intelligence—with a remarkably clear record for a newspaper which approved of England's going in. Even more important during its second half century than before, it naturally owes much to the personal integrity and capacity of Mr. C. P. Scott, editor since 1872 and owner since 1905, whose long control has served to give the *Guardian* its masterful unity and continuity. At the same time, the paper has been more than a personal organ. It has attracted to it many kindred dispositions among journalists and public men, and it has found enough readers to constitute, throughout the United Kingdom, a substantial block of public opinion which cannot be stampeded by the noise of the herd periodically thundering off in this or that direction under the influence of this or that frenzy. What seems most interesting—most encouraging—about the career of the *Guardian* is the fact that it has not been an endowed organ, maintained by some philanthropist or other, but a normal business enterprise, which has paid its own way out of its own lawful earnings.

Two qualities have, perhaps, done most to account for its influence. One is its admirable combination of local interest with international outlook. While the provincial newspapers of Britain do not carry the burden of neighborhood small talk which is demanded of such papers in this country, still the *Guardian* has never neglected the affairs of Manchester. But the affairs of Manchester, as a manufacturing center for the world, happen to reach far; and the *Guardian* has let its eyes run along all the routes of trade, and so has continually directed the opinion of the British trading classes to the remotest consequences of their activities. The other quality of the paper which must be noted is its admirable temperateness of language and argument. This is not, however, though ordinary opinion says so, a characteristic English trait. The islands have made their mark on the world not half so much by sober reason as by eccentric vigor, impetuous courage, stubborn perseverances, lyrical rages. Yet the *Guardian*, holding its course in the midst of so much tumult, has employed no methods more ruthless than those of simple candor, no accents more loud than those of civil truth. That these methods have been effective it is for the violent and bad-tempered to deny and for the judicious to study and understand. For there exists no other daily in any other country which ranks with the *Guardian*. It is the greatest daily newspaper which our civilization today has to its credit.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Undesirable Sales Tax

AT last the sales tax has found a champion among the professional economists at the very moment when the Secretary of the Treasury flatly rejects it. In a statement published in the newspapers of April 25, Professor Charles J. Bullock, of Harvard University, declares himself flat-footedly for the tax. "I offer it," he says, "as the sane and logical solution of this country's greatest problem. Taxation such as that under which we are at present suffering creates a nation of liars. The present tax would almost wholly become a tax on honesty if it is allowed to continue." This notable accession to their ranks must be embarrassing to some of the supporters of this measure. So long as the professional economists and tax experts, led by such men as Seligman of Columbia and Adams of Yale, were solidly against them they countered by pointing out with great directness, and with rather bad manners, the inherent folly of expecting trustworthy advice from theorists and college professors. In that organ of sound finance, the *Bache Review*, the influence of such "doctors" was stamped as a "menace" to our national welfare. But now that one economist declares himself in favor of the tax, what is the result? His opinion is hailed by the president of the "Tax League of America," whatever that may be, as the "most important remark yet made in favor of the sales tax," and Professor Bullock himself is crowned "the very highest authority in the country on this subject." This is all very well. Let both the eminence, if not the preeminence, of Professor Bullock and the importance of his remark be quickly conceded. Nevertheless, in introducing the testimony of Professor Bullock, do they not acknowledge the value of what the other theorists and college professors have to say? In fact, some apologies seem to be due.

Word now comes from another professor. On the same day that Mr. Bullock announced his support of the sales tax, a letter arrived from Professor J. W. Garner, of the University of Illinois, just now giving the Harvard lectures on the Hyde Foundation in the provincial universities of France, which contained the following interesting paragraph, written in response to a request for information as to how the French tax on sales is working out in practice: "I have talked with several intelligent Frenchmen about the French law. They say it is impossible of execution; to enforce it would require an army of *fonctionnaires* so large that the cost would consume the proceeds of the tax. The comparatively few actually provided give their attention to the larger firms, leaving the *petit commerçants* to go free. In consequence, the payment of the tax is largely voluntary. Nearly everybody who makes declarations of their business understates the amount . . ." Professor Garner confirms the press reports regarding the disappointing yield of the tax, stating that the collections will fall at least sixty per cent below the budget estimate. He reports that "all the Chambers of Commerce and Commercial Unions of France have protested against the law" and that in general French experience indicates the probable failure of the sales tax under conditions obtaining in America. Thus, while the income tax, according to Professor Bullock, is making us a nation of liars, the sales tax, according to Professor Garner, is having the same effect upon France. This simply means that the administration has broken down in both cases. But the fact that France has found the tax fraught with administrative difficulties is of great importance to us. France, of course, is not distinguished for the excellence of her fiscal administration generally, but the fact remains that a tax of the type we are being urged to adopt is proving difficult to administer in that country. It must be remembered always that the proposed sales tax is to be *in addition* to the income tax. Only a few of the most extreme adherents of the measure see in it a complete substitute for income taxation. Consequently, the Treasury, already three to four years behind with its income tax work, would be required to build up a machine capable of enforcing a tax on sales with enough to prevent us from becoming, or remaining, a nation of liars. The scope of this administrative task would depend largely upon the character of the tax but even if the levy were restricted to "goods, wares, and merchandise," the task would still be a very large one quantitatively. It would probably prove less difficult in its nature than the administration of the income tax. But even this should not be too readily conceded, for it requires no very active imagination to visualize a flood of Treasury regulations, decisions, rulings, and notes interpreting the nice questions as to when a sale is a sale. Leases, conditional sales, instalment sales, returned goods, bad debts, price guaranties, agency arrangements, and the complicated ramifications of accrual accounting are all involved in determining sales.

Those who defend the equity of the sales tax under the assumption that it will be completely shifted, must attempt to demonstrate that the gross expenditure is a more exact and satisfactory standard of ability to pay than net income. This is a hopeless task. A standard of gross expenditure would relieve savings from all taxes. Our greatest savers are the richest classes. But not only would the sales tax apply to a much larger share of the small man's income than of the rich man's, but the tax would also fall just as heavily on the small man's dollar as on the rich man's. This will not appeal strongly to those who believe in the equity of progressive taxation. Indeed, the sales tax is grossly unfair to the poor man, and should be dropped for that reason alone. Something might possibly be said for a small sales tax which would constitute a very minor part of the revenue system on the ground that it would amount to a minimum income tax on incomes too small to be reached by the method of direct listing. But this effect can, after all, be better gained by a few specific commodity taxes on articles of general consumption. Regarding the effects upon business, the testimony of a distinguished French scholar is worth citing. Gaston Jeze writes: "The tax is essentially a tax upon expenditures—the worst kind of tax for both producers and consumers. At this very time it tends to increase the price in a formidable manner; in consequence, it helps to restrain consumption; it helps to close channels of sales at the moment when it is necessary to open new ones. In my opinion, the tax upon sales prices is responsible in large measure for the economic crisis which has now begun and bids fair to be long and terrible." If forced by financial necessity to adopt this unattractive expedient, let us at least be intelligent enough to realize that it is not a refined and nicely adjusted piece of fiscal machinery, but at best a crude, difficult, unfair, and inequitable tax, to be got rid of in the shortest possible time.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Education

II. The Modern School

By EVELYN DEWEY

HOW are schools to reorganize so that every child shall have the real experiences that are necessary to enable him to be an efficient, independent, and creative member of society? If we examine all the new schools we will find many ways of approaching the problem. Public schools have done comparatively little toward a fundamental readjustment. Individuals in a system here and there have had the courage to do what was possible within one room to give their pupils a living education or to meet some crying need. But they have been hampered by the accepted notions of what a school must be, and by the machinery involved in meeting one of the biggest phases of the problem: compulsory attendance. Schools have reached every child. But this has been a wholesale task with administrative problems uppermost. Taxes, buildings, equipment, teachers' salaries, supervision, and attendance were new problems that must be met. We had inherited a curriculum. It was natural perhaps that it was used unquestioningly and the new things came to be thought of as the important things; as education. Teachers like Mrs. Harvey and Mr. Wirt have seen their problem unencumbered with traditional organization. They have built public schools that are giving as nearly a real education as external conditions allow. But such pioneers are rare.

The big colleges of education and their practice schools do not as a rule make rapid changes. They accept the traditional curriculum and organization by grades and subjects and work on efficiency problems. What is the best way to teach reading and writing; or how much arithmetic should a child of ten know? Such work has done a great deal to make teachers conscious of the technique of their profession. The standardized tests for each grade in each subject have shown up the amount of bad teaching; the extent to which children go through grade after grade and assimilate practically nothing of what the teacher is spreading before them. By showing it up they have forced teachers to rejuvenate themselves to the extent of seeing that their grade was up to standard not only in what was presented but in what was learned. They have also been the moving force in introducing handwork in the public school system.

The practice schools of these institutions have put the findings of the departments of education into practice. The Horace Mann School in New York and the University Elementary School in Chicago serve as demonstrations of expert methods and so furnish the concrete inspiration for progress and improvement for many teachers. They also serve as laboratories for experiments in new subject matter or gradual changes in organization.

For the fundamental reorganizations that are attempting to express a complete and organic conception of education we must look to a different group of schools. Some of these, like the Lincoln School in New York and the Francis Parker School in Chicago, are working toward the realization of their conception under conditions that approach those in the public school systems of our middle-sized cities. A good many smaller schools, like the City and Country School, the Moraine Park School, or the Shady Hill School, are attempting to work out even more complete reorganizations. Comparatively free from administrative and traditional problems, they are attempting to express a definite educational purpose of the founders. The philosophies of these schools vary widely. But there is one fundamental point of agreement. Real education is impossible without freedom. This is the ABC of educational theory. Without freedom interest is impossible and without interest real work is impossible. Mental training and discipline do not come from thwarting interest, nor from an endless performance of imposed and difficult tasks. They come from the opportunity to find expression for real interests, those generated within the child, and to bring them to their conclusion in a finished piece of work. This kind of work cannot go on under traditional classroom routine, where the curriculum is divided into pieces by minutes and fed to the children by a teacher with absolute power. It demands an organization that permits children to work together in groups on different things that have some meaning to them as children.

The Children's School in New York City furnishes a convenient example of what a school is like and what it can accomplish when it organizes to meet these conditions. The head of the school believes that the conscious aim of every teacher should be the fullest development of each pupil. This development includes freeing all the child's capacities so that they can find expression. But real expression demands a well-developed self-control. In order to think honestly, carry out all the processes in making something or work with a group a person must not only be free to express himself, he must also be able to do his work up to standard and adjust it to his surroundings. This means that the physical life of the child, his health, muscular control, and coordination are the business of the school. His intellectual development is its business, too. He must get control of the necessary tools of knowledge, books, figures, and expressing his thoughts and he must learn to use these tools in an honest, accurate, and objective way. But it is the school's business to see that in developing these faculties it does not do violence to the child's emotional life. Physical and intellectual control cannot exist unless an individual is able to adjust to his surroundings temperamentally as well. He must find scope for what creative ability he has, freedom in social intercourse, and intelligence in meeting his disabilities and likes and dislikes.

The school organization makes the achievement of these theories possible through the everyday life and creative activities of the children. The school-day lasts from nine in the morning until four in the afternoon, except for the very little children. There is a hot dinner at noon and a rest time for all the children. Afternoon school is devoted to excursions for science or history, play, games, skating, and swimming or to some special project in the shop or studio. The children work in small classes of from ten to twenty. The classes are made up of children of about the same age and experience. There are no promotions or re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peating grades because a child is behind in some specific part of his lesson. The class works together year after year and an individual is moved only when he is too old or too young to work as an efficient part of his group.

The building is not equipped in the conventional way. There are no screwed-down desks and no platform for the teacher. Instead each class has two good-sized rooms. In one there are chairs and a small table for each child and a library of the books the class is using. This room is used for the regular lessons, for reading, writing, and for class discussion. The other room is used as a workshop and recreation room for the class. It is equipped with a work bench or two, with tools and with the materials that are being used in any plan that is on foot at the time, such as the scenery and costumes for a play. There are two science rooms where classes go for work that requires special equipment. One is used for a greenhouse. Here the older children have been learning about soils and seed germination by analyzing soils and raising tiny crops. Two kitchens open off the dining-room. One is for getting the school dinner. The other is for the children. Here a small group will prepare one of the dishes for lunch, each child making a small portion, or they will get the whole meal for their class. There are two roof playgrounds on the school. One of these belongs to the little children, where they play outdoors most of the day. There are a sandbox, a slide, a seesaw, and plenty of playthings. The children have real constructive play, instead of the idleness forced on them by days in city parks or streets.

The school program is kept as flexible as possible. The only formal time for the youngest children is their midmorning lunch and a short time for story telling. The rest of the morning they play with all sorts of free material, blocks, paper and crayon, or scissors, clay, etc. Montessori materials are on low shelves where the children can get them when they want to. A number of very young children learn to write and form words without any formal lessons with this material. As far as possible they are allowed to learn to read and write when they begin to be interested in it. Sometimes a child needs a little urging from the teacher, but usually the example of the rest of the children sends him to it when he is ready for it. The teacher's function is that of a leader. She answers questions, gives technique, sees that the children get along together, and that their work or play develops significantly so old experiences become the basis for new activities that increase their power and information.

The older children have definite hours for French, cooking, science, or history, any subject that requires special equipment or a special teacher. The rest of their day is spent with the class teacher. She devotes enough time to drill in reading, writing, spelling, and arithmetic so that the children's command of these things does not lag behind their intellectual interests or their experience. But this drill is never presented as an end in itself. The children realize their need for these tools because the real experiences they are having in science, on their excursions or on the playground, are constantly calling for them. By following this plan of giving intensive drill when a class needs or is interested in a particular process the school has found the children keep ahead of the conventional school curriculum. Classes are given opportunities to check themselves up by the standardized school tests. They are usually ahead of other classes of their age, but if they have lagged behind in anything the children themselves are the first ones to ask for a chance to catch up, their greater freedom early developing a sense of responsibility in them.

The same care is taken to see that the rest of the school work is done up to standard. A real carpenter comes in to help a class that is interested in toy-making. A college history teacher lectures to the three oldest classes once a week on American history. He gives them the inspiration and background for the detailed work they do with their classroom teachers. An Indian woman comes in the afternoons and tells the children about the literature and customs of her people. She teaches them dyeing and basketry as these trades were carried on by her tribe. Cooking includes the marketing and keeping accounts and paying bills.

No fixed lessons are assigned from textbooks. Instead a number of different books are put on the shelves and each child does his own piece of work on the subject that is being studied. The interests of the class are followed in deciding what to work on. These interests develop naturally from one piece of work to the next. A constructive thread is given the reading by having different kinds of books on the classroom shelves. If the majority of the class become interested in one book it is made the point of departure for a study of that period or class of books.

The children are made to realize that the school is theirs. The older classes run themselves and elect a chairman every week to see that the rooms are kept in order; that the class gets to lessons on time, and that the pupils are quiet and considerate when they are studying. The teacher is a member of the class and has her say about what shall be done with the others. Even in class discussion a child acts as chairman and the teacher is the leader only because of her greater skill and experience instead of through a position of dictatorship. She also performs the important function of seeing that each child has a fair chance with the other members of the group. But the children are remarkably just when shown the right standards. The order, courtesy, and workmanlike spirit of the classes stand out. The school seems to realize its aim of being a real world where each pupil is learning to live by living physically, intellectually, and creatively all the time.

There may be comparatively little in the financing, daily program, or class procedure of this school that could be bodily translated to public schools today. But from such schools the public can get a vision of its job; a vision that will enable it to raise a generation without the blind spots, the ignorance, and the stamp of standardized inferiority that makes the majority of people a stumbling block in the way of their own achievement. It is not the school's fault that these conditions exist; but the schools are the only places where fundamental changes can be wrought, because they are the only places that give everyone a chance. When you realize this many of the fundamental changes worked out in private schools can easily be taken over in public schools. Isolated teachers have already developed organization plans to make the transfer. The duplicate school plan of Mr. Wirt's and the Dalton Laboratory Plan have proved that it is possible to adopt some of the essential points in the practice of progressive private schools in the present public school systems. But the changes in public schools will not be general until you stop judging schools good because they are like the ones you went to or because no child dares speak or move in them. They belong to you and cannot change very much until you want them to.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

France's Second Verdun

By LEWIS S. GANNETT

Paris, April 18

MAY Day this year will bring to France no such nation-wide strike as stopped the railroads and disrupted industry a year ago, nor any such impressive cessation of the capital's life as was staged before the peace delegates two years past. But it brings France face to face with a crisis more important than either of these, a crisis which some, both radicals and conservatives, liken to a second Verdun in the uncertainty and fatefulness of its outcome. The cities and villages of the north of France, despite optimistic and misleading official figures, are still in ruins; equally official and more relevant figures[1] suggest that it will require ten years at the very least, and probably twice that, to rebuild the heaps of stone that were homes; and money for the rebuilding is not forthcoming either from Germany or France. May Day is the date set by the Treaty of Versailles for fulfilment by the Germans of obligations which they have not and will not have fulfilled, and the date on which the Allies will have a treaty right to apply "sanctions." The present supposition is that France will adopt the "strong hand on the collar" policy, occupy more German territory, blockade German ports, and take other measures intended to reduce Germany to a state of subjection and utter misery. France must choose: either to ruin Germany, thereby eliminating, as she hopes, any menace of military or economic competition for decades to come, but by the same token giving up hope of money or goods for reparations; or to cooperate actively and openly with Germany, and get what reparation is thus possible. The former policy seems to most American and British observers in France today to be suicidal; yet it is the officially announced policy of the French Government.

There is no group in France fighting vigorously and effectively against this policy which can only add to the French military budget and reduce the reparations receipts. Trade-union leaders and Socialists oppose it, but they do not dare or care to wage a strenuous campaign against it. The Communists watch the spectacle with a kind of grim amusement, welcoming, as a forerunner to their revolution, the financial havoc which it causes. But Socialists, Communists, and trade unionists in France today are most of all interested in attacking each other, and they are almost without influence on the course of Governmental policy. There is no doubt that M. Briand himself is well aware of the impossibility of the French demands, and of the futility of a screaming-eagle policy, but he is more politician than statesman, and like Mr. Lloyd George, he is the prisoner of a stupid and reactionary Parliament, elected rather for its super-patriotism than for its common sense. Former President Poincaré, vigorously demanding what he calls "action," is maneuvering to win Briand's premiership from him, and Briand cares more for power than principle. The present Parliament is incapable of abandoning flag-waving for reasoned discussion of economic possibilities, despite the disillusionment caused by the evident failure of Viviani's mission to America, and by the terrible revelations of the new budget. (Apart from the 15 to 20 billions of paper francs for which there are as yet no receipts, these being supposedly charged to Germany, the ordinary budget shows such astounding deficits as 820 million paper francs in the operation of the railroads, 628 million in the post and telegraph service, etc.) Briand, while busily denouncing the Germans in public, has been nervously negotiating with them ever since the London Conference was broken off, but he does not dare adopt the policy which he knows to be reasonable.

It is easy to understand why the French are so unwilling to face disagreeable realities. They have always been rather impossibilist romanticists—but for that they would never have held Verdun against impossible odds in 1916. They are today the most vanquished victors which this world has ever seen, and quite unwilling to abandon the unreal glories of victory for the realities of a world defeat which has hit them worst of all. They stand alone among the great Powers in what they have suffered. Their population is reduced by millions; those who are left are for the most part the old and the very young, weakened by war-time privation. The state is, according to ordinary standards, close to bankruptcy. Their best industrial regions lie in ruins. A million of their people are still without homes worthy of the name. All this they suffered and are suffering in what Allied statesmen always called a common cause. Today America stands aloof; England seeks, in French eyes, only profitable commerce with Germany; Germany piteously cries that she cannot pay. And when France tries to collect, as a first charge, the cost of her army of occupation—an army of more than 60,000 men—she finds the Americans presenting for an army only one-fifth as large a bill almost equal to her own, and demanding simultaneous payment.[2] No wonder she feels isolated, frustrated, and acts as a frustrated man does, blindly and foolishly. When Frenchmen discover the wicked unreality of the war-time promises that Germany would pay for everything, they are less likely to study methods of partial payment than to shrug their shoulders and revert to the "je-m'en-ficheisme" of "Que voulez-vous? C'est la guerre!" days. In such a mood, the premise that France is ruined readily leads to the conclusion that Germany should be ruined, too. That the premise is false does not alter the state of mind.

It is true that there are industrial and financial interests which have realized the necessity of a Franco-German business entente. The proposal that the French be given shares in German enterprises has been favorably commented on in several of the manufacturing and financial journals, and it is generally understood that M. Loucheur, the war-made millionaire Minister for the Liberated Regions, is so little averse to Franco-German cooperation that he has, in some of his interests, formed a working alliance with Hugo Stinnes, the jingo German capitalist who also made his pile from war-time speculation and who is commonly referred to in France as the dictator of German policy. One

[1] Less than 3 per cent of the destroyed houses have been rebuilt. The optimistic official statements refer almost entirely to the repair of "partially destroyed" houses, many of which had merely lost a chimney or suffered one or two shell-holes.

[2] The costs of the armies of occupation to May 1, 1921, apart from material requisitioned in Germany and paid for in paper marks requisitioned from the German Government, will be about as follows: France, 1,215 million gold marks; United States, 1,022 M.M.; Great Britain, 895 M.M.; Belgium, 220 M.M.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

French official in touch with business interests told me that he regarded it as most unfortunate that France had permitted Lloyd George to stop Stinnes speaking at Spa. "Two strong men have emerged," he said, "one on each side of the frontier: Stinnes and Loucheur. They are the only two men capable of solving the reparations problem; get them to cooperate and the problem can be solved; otherwise probably not." War-time profiteers play a curiously large role in these plans; after all they are the men, dirty as they are, who have shown executive ability in the system which men are seeking to preserve and restore. The proposal for French participation in German capital is being urged in the German press by that romantic profiteer Dr. Helphand ("Parvus") who escaped to Germany and after a brilliant academic career made a penurious living writing for German Socialist papers, then early in the war intrigued for the German Government at Constantinople and Sofia, became rich, subsidized imperialist Socialist papers, had villas in four capitals, and, until revelations of food speculations led to his expulsion, was with King Constantine the only foreigner authorized to use an automobile in the canton of Zurich. Arnold Rechberg, in the *Berliner Tageblatt*, has also suggested that France be given a one-third share in all profits of German enterprises, and elaborately demonstrated that this should soon yield France an annual return of three billion gold marks. His article has been widely quoted in the French press, and while the plan is thus far a mere sketch, it is being studied by experts of the Reparation Commission.

This program of a money return to France is naturally welcomed in certain industrial circles which do not relish plans for payment in goods. It was undiplomatic of Herr Simons to say so, but it is notorious in France that enormous profits are being made out of reconstruction, and that important French interests have been opposed to material aid from Germany because it would have cut into their profits and opportunities for profit. You cannot talk for five minutes with a French architect or engineer or government official without hearing such complaints. Deputy Jean Henessy has publicly charged in *L'Œuvre* that there is "a conspiracy among French reconstruction profiteers to prevent reconstruction by the Germans." France, if she is to have her wounds healed, must lend a very sympathetic ear to German proposals for reparation in kind, for mass manufacture of houses in parts in Germany, and for the use of German labor in the immediate work of reconstruction. Thus far, France has made large demands for building materials, in general, but has declined to specify details and place of delivery, and in the few cases where details have been given, there have been the usual Franco-German bickerings over the price at which German deliveries are to be credited, France insisting upon the low price current in Germany, Germany upon the higher price current in the world market. It is one of the great faults of the treaty that it contains no method of judicial judgment of such disputes; reference to the Reparation Commission obviously is to a partisan body.

Delivery of coal cannot be carried much farther than it has already gone. Germany has been delivering on an average more than two million tons per month since the Spa Conference last July, and although she is about 500,000 tons behind on her total deliveries, that is less than 3 per cent arrears, and the French do not need the extra coal. The present industrial depression has left France actually with a surplus of coal and she is said to be selling German coal abroad. Indeed, a former member of the Reparation Commission privately prophesies that a year or two hence Germany will be fighting to pay more of her indemnity in coal than France will be willing to accept.

German workmen if used in France would obviously have to be lodged in colonies in the liberated regions. There are plenty of jingoes in Paris and a few people in the ruined villages to applaud the cry of Deputy Grespel, "Rather than see them profaned by the hands of assassins we would prefer that our ashes be left in peace and our ruins left untouched in the majesty of their desolation." Deputy Grespel himself, to be sure, though mayor of ruined La Bassée, lives comfortably in one of the finest streets of unshelled Lille. There is little doubt that the peasant whose words are reported by Senator Polié is more typical. "I would rather have the Germans mend my roof," he said, "than have no roof at all." Three times the Germans have made propositions regarding the use of German labor in the North of France, and M. Loucheur has recently admitted in debate that the chief reason for non-acceptance of these offers was that the Germans demanded ordinary trade-union rights. That, he said, he would never admit. He also took occasion to protest because the Germans even suggested baths and reading rooms, but surely these are not extraordinary demands when hundreds of men workers are to be asked to work far from their families in a foreign land. Even unemployed Paris workmen balk at being sent into the lonely North. The French Government has been able to import nearly a hundred thousand Polish laborers, who are now working in the mines and villages of the devastated districts at low wages, without baths or reading-rooms and without trade-union rights; it has also imported a considerable number of Italians who do without bath-rooms, and it is obvious that difficulties might arise should German workmen come in and be better treated. That is the real sticking-point. French labor stands with the Germans in this matter, but thus far in vain. Representatives of the French and German national building trades unions recently met at Geneva and reached a detailed agreement, satisfactory to both groups, regarding conditions of employment of German labor in France. The French workers themselves object to the employment of Germans under conditions inferior to those under which they themselves work, and insist that German workers should have the same union rights as the French and be affiliated with the French building trades union. The building trades have not suffered the same unemployment as other industries in France, and the trade unions are ardently advocating the use of German labor in reconstruction.

Labor groups have recently been very active in developing what they call constructive programs for reconstruction. The General Confederation of Labor, in association with the allied Economic Council of Labor, in which the cooperatives and the engineers' union are also represented, sent a commission through the devastated districts to study conditions and report suggestions. These suggestions, without important modification, were adopted at the International Trade Union Conference which met at Amsterdam March 31 and April 1. In brief, they urged greater utilization of the cooperatives, both in evaluation of damages and in rebuilding, reconstruction of large sectors by German labor using German material, financing of international loans by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the cities of the North, with the German indemnity as ultimate guaranty. A similar program was adopted at a meeting of representatives of the German Independent Social Democratic Party, of the British Independent Labor Party, and of the French Socialist Party (the moderate minority which refused to accept Communist leadership) at almost the same time.

These programs are favorably regarded far outside the ranks of labor. In the present temper of French politics they suffer by the fact that they are advanced by Socialists or syndicalists, but the desperate need is becoming so evident that even non-Socialists such as the mayor of Rheims respond to the Labor Confederation's call for a conference on the situation, and accept office in the Confederation's new organization. Anything suggesting international loans, too, is sure to be welcomed in France. The French have never abandoned the feeling that their debts are Allied debts, incurred in a war in which all the Allies shared and should have shared in proportion to their resources, in which French losses, both in men and material damage, surpassed all the rest; and that ultimately the quondam Allies will have to share the burden of France's financial difficulties.

Yet these various projects are still too hazy, too purely paper propositions, to receive the serious detailed attention necessary before May Day. Loud voices call for "action," and "action," if only as a screen for negotiation, is almost sure to come. The tragic question is whether that action, itself a mere gesture, may not render futile further discussion of these constructive plans, and make the restoration of northern France an insoluble problem. The actionists refuse to face that question; of those who do face it only the Communists smile. The impasse fits their theories to a T. As a Belgian Communist put it, "The two capitalisms are faced today with a problem caused by their own errors, their own contradictions, their very nature. It is impossible for them. In vain they attempt to solve it, in vain the victorious capitalism tries to discharge upon the conquered capitalism a maximum part of its burdens. The recent incidents are only a continuation of the war born of capitalism, and it will continue"—until the revolution. The Communists today count upon the folly of the French actionists to bring on financial ruin and achieve for them the revolution which their own propaganda has been unable to bring about. No wonder thinking radicals and conservatives liken France's present crisis to a second Verdun.

A Footnote to Egyptian History[1]

By HIRAM K. MODERWELL

WHENEVER a political dispute becomes hot, certain simple clichés gain popular currency, purporting to describe the situation. These are usually misleading and sometimes wholly false. Now the cliché which expresses most people's understanding of the Egyptian situation runs somewhat like this: "England offered Egypt virtual independence, but the Egyptians are still quarreling over the details." And this is one of the wholly false kind.

It is true that what happened *looks* very like the cliché version. After the Egyptian rebellion of the spring of 1919, the British Government sent to Egypt the Milner Mission to investigate the disease and its remedies, under terms of reference which allowed it great latitude. The Mission, in several months, excogitated a scheme which would grant the form and most of the substance of national independence to Egypt, under a close alliance with Great Britain, only reserving to the latter limited military garrison rights for the protection of the Suez Canal; limited supervision over the departments of finance and justice, to protect foreign interests after the contemplated abolition of the Capitulations; and the right to exercise a certain fatherly care in regard to Egypt's foreign relations.

The Mission then sought to obtain the consent of the Egyptian Nationalists, through their recognized representatives headed by Zaghlul Pasha. The Egyptian delegates demanded that in addition to the articles of the Milner memorandum, the British protectorate over Egypt be formally abolished; that the powers of the financial adviser be limited and defined; that Egypt be granted "equal rights with Great Britain in the Sudan"; and that the size and privileges of the British army in Egypt be clearly stated. And there matters stuck.

Now all this is fairly described by the cliché which I have quoted, except for one nuance which makes all the difference. The Milner proposal never was an "offer" from the British Government. It was merely the recommendation of the Mission. True, the Government announced that Parliament would consider the Milner memorandum in due time, and that eventually some action would be taken on the Egyptian question. But it stayed at a distance from the memorandum itself as though it were an explosive shell.

"Why, then," you may ask, "did the Milner Mission negotiate with Zaghlul Pasha and his delegation?" The official British answer is that it didn't *negotiate* but only "conversed"; and the delegation was not a *delegation* but only a group of conversers. Why, anyone could offer his advice to the British Government concerning Egypt, and then go and chat with his Egyptian friends about it. But that wouldn't bind the British Government. Surely you can see that. But, one may still object, certainly the British Government would not have gone to all the trouble of appointing the Milner Mission and making public its recommendations and facilitating discussion if it had not meant to offer the Egyptians something of the sort.

The difficulty is explained by one very simple fact: When the Milner report was written, Great Britain was most awfully frightened over her position in Egypt. Now, she isn't. The Egyptian uprising caused more acute distress to the British imperialist mind than anything that had happened within the Union Jack's orbit since the Boer War. The British imperialist mind hadn't believed the uprising possible, but now that it was possible, it believed anything possible. It seems certain that the imperialist mind was convinced there was nothing to do but make its rapid getaway with as much dignity as possible.

But later a new and unexpected factor came to British aid, a factor which imperialism had never reckoned with

[1] The report of the Milner Mission and the reply of the Egyptian Nationalists were published in the International Relations Section of *The Nation* in its issues of April 6, 13, 20.—EDITOR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and whose very existence it doggedly denied. That factor was the class struggle. It may seem quaint that the class struggle should come to the aid of imperialism, but the thing is unintelligible only to those who insist on thinking in clichés. Briefly, Britain has always maintained her hold over Egypt by protecting the poor peasants against the native landlords and bureaucrats. During the war, she allowed this protection to lapse, and permitted numerous outrages on the peasants to be perpetrated in her name. So for a few brief months after the war, the devil in the peasants' mind ceased to be the landlord and became the British. It was this momentary alliance between the classes, and only this, that made the 1919 situation serious. It mattered little to the British what the city mobs might do; they could always be quelled by a whiff of grapeshot. But it made all the difference when the peasants cut the railroads and telegraphs, isolated the various portions of the British army, and began massacring British soldiers at leisure. Britain sent her best man, Lord Allenby, to Egypt to make what he could of the bad business. He exorcised the immediate peril. Then things began gradually to get quieter. The British ruling class, which didn't understand what made the trouble, failed equally to understand what was curing it. It, doubtless, gives Lord Allenby all the credit. There is no evidence that it made any attempt to manipulate the class struggle to its own advantage as British imperialism at its shrewdest would do.

But the class struggle manipulated itself, with the aid of cotton. There came an era of unimagined prosperity for the cotton-raising peasants. They forgot about the "tyrant" in Cairo, and if there was an enemy left it was the rack-renter and usurer in the village. They resumed their ancient struggle with the native oppressor for the product of the soil. They no longer responded readily to the peregrinating student propagandists from El-Hazar. The Cairo mobs might still make newspaper copy, but they could not make revolution. Egypt was once more, in the face of the Briton, divided—and conquered.

Now, whether the British ruling class fully understood this or not, they knew that the change had taken place. And they repented them of their folly. Were they going to relinquish Egypt? Whoever said anything of the sort? As for the Milner memorandum, it represented only the opinion of Lord Milner and his associates. "It should never have been given to the press," said Lord Allenby to me. The British Government would deal with the matter at the opportune time, and when it saw fit to negotiate it would negotiate not with "unauthorized persons," like Zaghlul, but with the Egyptian Government. (It is part of the British genius for government to be able to say things like this in an earnest and affable manner, and with an absolutely straight face, as though the "Egyptian Government" were anything more than a British committee.)

It is possible that the politicians whose business is politics, as distinguished from the politicians whose business is war, do not regret that the Milner memorandum was given to the press. It made a splendid impression on the world, and it kept a large part of Egypt quiet during several critical months. But the time for that is past. Instead, comes something new.

The Milner Mission had been authorized to report on "the form of government which, *under the Protectorate*, will be best calculated to promote," etc. But now, contemporaneously with the visit of Mr. Winston Churchill, the new Minister of Colonies, it decides to inquire "what type of relation between Great Britain and Egypt can best be substituted for the present Protectorate." Now this implies the repudiation of the Milner scheme, which has probably by this time become nothing better than an "archive." And somehow it suggests to the innocent reader that the Protectorate, like the Milner report, is to be canceled in order to meet the wishes of the Egyptian Nationalists. Yet it can as well mean that Egypt is to become a British colony.

Whatever the British Government contemplates, it has repudiated any implied responsibility for the Milner "offer," and has sent its new Minister of Colonies to Egypt. Just what legitimate business the Minister of Colonies might have in a nation which forms no part of the British Empire is not stated. Anyhow, Mr. Winston Churchill is there, and we must suspect that his business is somehow connected with Egypt and with colonies.

The only official statement of British policy that I know of is Lord Allenby's assertion that whatever the Government grants to Egypt it will be in the direction of increasing self-government for the Egyptians. That is a wise formula, for sudden and complete independence would find Egypt ill equipped to manage herself. It would put in power the land-owning and city professional classes, who have had little experience in governing, and might conceivably bring about chaos in a few years' time.

It is really quite true, as the British assert, that the Egyptians are not ripe for self-government. But it is not solely the Egyptians who are to blame. The intelligentsia of the country have in general been kept out of responsible government offices by the British administration, and those who have been permitted to serve have often been chosen for their servility rather than for their ability. Education is terribly degraded, for it has been definitely a part of British policy not wantonly to encourage the increase in the number of persons able to read inflammatory Egyptian newspapers. Even the technical schools are in one way or another kept effectually subservient to the interests of the British occupation.

Yet there is easily enough ability, even enough disinterested patriotism, among the Egyptians to enable them to administer their affairs after five or ten years of apprenticeship granted to them in good faith. To my mind the substantial criticism which can be made against the British occupation is that it has not earnestly sought to provide this apprenticeship. There is today, probably, a larger percentage of British in the responsible public services than when Lord Cromer ruled. And young Britishers are still continuously coming out to take the posts which the Egyptians covet.

I think the evidence of Britain's good intentions toward Egypt would be found not in a sudden dramatic withdrawal from Egypt, but in a deliberate, gradual, and honest withdrawal from Egyptian affairs in favor of Egyptians. She could, in this interval, undo some of the wrongs committed against the peasants and fortify their position in the commonwealth. She could, and of course would, protect what she considers the essential interests of the Empire and of foreigners, by measures similar to those contemplated in the Milner memorandum. This would offer a good chance of peace and prosperity for all concerned. But if the Minister of Colonies is contemplating adding Egypt to his permanent collection it is hard to foresee anything but chronic trouble.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Driftway

OREGON is a State of which much good is doubtless to be said, but somehow it fails to bring its citizens up with a proper respect for what is elsewhere known as "a debt of honor." In other communities such a debt represents a gambling loss, and is the one Simon-pure debt in most men's code of morals. As it is legally uncollectable, it is the one debt that most men insist upon paying, without fail and without pressure. The only crime worse than repudiating a gambling debt is to squeal about a gambling loss. Now it appears from the public prints that a man in Oregon has done both—and worse. He has taken advantage of one of those strange laws to protect gamblers from their folly which no one ever stooped to invoke heretofore. It seems that one Sol Swire lost $800 to one Joseph Mozorosky at the great American game of poker. Now, if ordinary gambling debts are sacred, those incurred in poker are super sacrosanct; but, apparently, Sol doesn't know it. He sued Mozorosky for double the amount of his loss, under a State law permitting such action, and a morally obtuse jury gave him the full amount. Mozorosky declined to pay, whereupon Sol invoked an ancient law authorizing a body execution against persons refusing to honor court awards. This landed Mozorosky in jail. Even so, he might have escaped after ten days, by taking the pauper's oath, had he not inadvertently testified in court that he was worth $16,000. So Mozorosky stays in jail, the great American game of poker is dishonored, and the morals of Oregon go to the dogs.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Revise the Treaty of Versailles!

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: More than two years have now elapsed since the Central Powers sued for peace, and actual fighting between them and the Entente ceased. Even yet, however, the world is not at peace; nowhere have normal conditions of life been restored, while over lands inhabited by hundreds of millions of people it has not been possible even to begin the work of restoration. To us as to many thousands more this is a profound disappointment, not only because such a state of things is deplorable in itself, but because of the high hopes that might reasonably have been entertained in November, 1918.

The Allies, it must be remembered, one and all accepted as a basis for the future peace the famous Fourteen Points of President Wilson. Whether, in any case, the Central Powers would then or later have been compelled to surrender at discretion, it is certain they had every right to expect a settlement substantially on the basis then laid down. And had the terms ultimately imposed at Versailles been conceived in the spirit to which this program committed the Entente, it is certain that immeasurably greater progress in the task of reconciliation and reconstruction would have been made ere now. The Fourteen Points not only represented the opinion of President Wilson, they put into definite shape ideas that had been forming in the minds of thinking people ever since the world began.

The Union of Democratic Control in this country and similar organizations abroad had familiarized the world with the ideas of (1) democratic control in foreign politics, (2) increased freedom of international trade, (3) reduction of armaments, (4) self-determination of peoples, and (5) a League of Nations.

The peace treaty has been dictated by men who have proclaimed, but have not followed, these ideals. It is a settlement, not arrived at by any "general association of nations," but dictated by the victors in the Great War. It has not secured a diplomacy proceeding "frankly and in the public view," as the discreditable intrigues with the Russian adventurers in arms against the Bolsheviks and the secret agreement between France and Belgium show. It has not prevented the blockade of a great part of Europe in peace time. It has done nothing to check the drift of Central Europe into famine and revolution.

The revision of the Versailles Treaty in the light of modern international thought, of the pre-armistice utterances of President Wilson culminating in the Fourteen Points, and even in the earlier utterances of the Entente statesmen themselves is imperative. This revision should be carried out by the representatives of all nations, irrespective of the parts they played during the Great War, and should aim at:

1. The abrogation of all clauses in the treaty which demand ruinous and unworkable indemnities and other crippling economic conditions;
2. The immediate and general reduction of armaments;
3. The publication and registration of all existing treaties and understandings with a definite repudiation by each Power of any secret understandings to which it may be committed;
4. The honest application of the principle of self-determination with adequate safeguards for racial minorities;
5. The provision of adequate credits to countries ruined by the war, accompanied and conditioned by a wide extension of freedom of trade;
6. The immediate admission, on the same terms as those admitting the original framers of the League, of any nation desirous of joining the League of Nations;
7. An adequate supervision of the mandates by the League in order to secure the liberty and well-being of the native races and an open door for trade.

The world has taken the wrong road and has manifestly lost its way; it can only recover it by retracing its steps to the sign post erected by those who had studied the path to peace. To preserve civilization now manifestly threatened by destruction, it is necessary to go back to the policy identified with the Fourteen Points and to the widespread world ideal which it embodies.

A. Aall (professor of philosophy at University of Christiania), William A. Albright, Norman Angell, Lord Ashton of Hyde, Lady Barlow, Henri Barbusse, Sir Hugh Bell, H. N. Brailsford, Charles Roden Buxton, Noel Buxton, Lady Byles, Edward Carpenter, Lord Henry Cavendish Bentinck, Lady Courtney, A. C. Drolsum (chief librarian University of Christiania), Miss M. E. Durham, Very Rev. Moore Ede, Norman Garstin, Principal A. E. Garvie, Lady Dorothea Gibb, Y. Gleditsch (dean of the Diocese of Christiania), General Gough, (Mrs.) M. A. Hamilton, Knut Hamsun (Nobel prize-winner in literature for Sweden), Carl Heath, J. A. Hobson, Jerome K. Jerome, Rudolf Kycken (professor at University of Upsala), R. C. Lambert, H. B. Lees Smith, Sir H. S. Leon, Lucien Le Foyer (sec.-general of Délégation Permanente des Sociétés Françaises de la Paix), Jean Longuet (editor of *Le Populaire*), Earl Loreburn, J. Ramsay Macdonald, (Mme.) Magdeleine Marx, Y. Meinich (former mayor of Christiania), Lord Mersey, F. Merttens, S. Michelet (professor of theology at University of Christiania), P. A. Molteno, Oscar Montelius (Ph.D., LL.D., Stockholm), E. D. Morel, Dr. W. E. Orchard, Lord Parmoor, Sir George Paish, Arthur Ponsonby, Arnold Rowntree, (Miss) Evelyn Sharp, G. Bernard Shaw, F. J. Shaw, Robert Smillie, (Mrs.) Ethel Snowden, Philip Snowden, Ben Spoor, M.P., (Mrs.) H. M. Swanwick, Gustaf F. Steffen (Ph.D., professor at University of Gothenburg), Bishop Y. Tandberg (Norway), Brig. Gen. C. B. Thomson, Gouttenoire de Courcy, Charles P. Trevelyan, Ben Turner, E. A. Walton, P.R.S.W., R.S.A., Professor James Ward, Lady Warwick, Israel Zangwill.

London, April 18

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books

The Suicidity of Suicide

The Next War. By Will Irwin. E. P. Dutton and Company.

WHAT is a "reasonable pacifist"? At first sight this would seem to be a contradiction in terms, like—let us say—a reasonable Christian or a reasonable capitalist, yet in human experience it is intelligible. Just as, no doubt, the reasonable Christian is one who while admiring the moral elevation of the Sermon on the Mount would never seriously consider applying its precepts to the practical business of living—and there are many such reasonable Christians even among the clergy; and just as a reasonable capitalist would be one who believes in the "square deal" between capital and labor provided he can dictate the terms of the deal—and in this sense there are few unreasonable capitalists; so the reasonable pacifist must be one who has nothing against war in itself as a human institution provided it does not go too far. If it can be proved not to pay he is against it. In this sense Mr. Irwin's "reasonable pacifism" as developed in his little primer on human suicide (which he rather lamely calls "The Next War") will satisfy the most unreasonable pacifist. War as conducted by modern societies not only does not pay either victor or vanquished, but if encouraged to ravage human society at the accelerated rate of intensity developed by science must lead inevitably to the degeneration and ultimate extinction of the human race.

Like a good journalist addressing a journalistically minded people, Mr. Irwin does not deal in large pulpit phrases and abstractions, which from their oft repeating seem to have lost all force as moralities on the modern mind. He is wary of "ideals" and "sentiments," in a world where reason and ideal have equally fallen into disrepute through betrayal. To the lethargic minded citizen who thinks "Men have always fought and always will fight, but the world has survived many wars and will outlast my time," Mr. Irwin addresses himself with an array of big figures and startling facts that may whip his jaded imagination to fresh conclusions. The probable developments of aerial and chemical warfare in future wars, by means of which noncombatants will be placed in the front line and instead of army corps whole populations will be wiped out, furnish his main argument. War is no longer the small enterprise of minorities; it is the will to suicide of the race. It is no longer a boil on the leg of humanity; it is a cancer of the vitals. Few escaped in some sort the consequences of the first world war; no one—man, woman, or child—will escape the consequences of the next.

Another, possibly more cogent, approach to the consciousness of the average citizen, harried by the income tax and the cost of food and rent, is through the pocket nerve, which is not merely the most sensitive but the most pervasive nerve in the anatomy of modern society. The figures of the war bill are so colossal that they must be translated into more comprehensible terms, and this translation Mr. Irwin has made so graphic that the remotest dweller in Gopher Prairie can easily estimate just what his immediate share in the cost of the recent seven years' debauch is. The morning after of payment for that debauch is likely to be so prolonged and so complicated that nobody can predict what the eventual payment must be. For all the money costs of a great war are not at once apparent and terminable, even after the lapse of generations. The remoter economic consequences of war may well be more terrible than the nearer ones, though less poignantly demonstrable by cinema and graph. Yet there can already be felt, in the embitterment of the class struggle over the vital question of who is to pay the bill for the war by lowered standards of life, one of the most poisonous results of the catastrophe. We know well enough what elements in the population have paid the lion's share of past wars. Economists tell us consolingly that war merely shifts the titles of property ownership from class to class. That may be. But the incidence of the burden meantime is shifted from the backs of the few to the broad shoulders of the many—secretly, inevitably, irresistibly. One can observe the preparations for this shifting in the attitude of the dominant political party in the United States. To prevent this process necessitates a dubious struggle for the worker, in which he is unwillingly engaged, at best an ugly one and a long one.

Mr. Irwin does not dwell on these remoter, more speculative aspects of the curse of war, for much deception has disillusioned the plain man about the abstract, the intangible, the spiritual. Yet the worst losses of great wars are not the material losses, which our industrial processes enable us to make good with comparative speed, nor even the human losses, terrible as they are and fatal to the improvement of the human species. The irreparable losses after all are the moral losses—the lowering and the coarsening of the entire standard of human life. We have had spectacular evidence these past two years of the degradation of popular government under the strain. If it had not been for the war, would England have tolerated the Lloyd George Government? or France her aimless imperialists? or America the cynical materialism of the present Administration? Government throughout the world is in the hands of mediocrities—or worse. And more universally the degeneration of all human relationships may be felt in the prevalence of violence, crime, dishonesty. Men in war having justified force and every egoism, having abandoned all pretense to chivalry, to the restraints of code or law, what loftier motivation should be expected in private life? What little of our vaunted civilization, for which so many million men died, is now left—a thing of spirit not of matter—will melt like chaff in the furnace of another outbreak of suicidal mania. These are the enduring losses of war, not the money and the munitions and the men.

The way to end war is to end it, and here the pure pacifist is on firmer ground than the "reasonable pacifist," who has to traffic gingerly with the specious principle of "preparedness." If the great war proved anything, it proved that the way of preparedness leads always and inevitably into war, and further that no two experts can agree as to what adequate preparedness means either in amount of armament or kind of armament. Preparedness is the thin coating of the professional militarist for the bitter pill of war, offered to the loose-minded civilian who thinks vaguely in terms of "cleaning up" this or that "backward" country (or nourishes secret fears of mob violence at home). The truculence of war leads naturally to the truculence of going armed to the teeth to prevent war! The first task of the sincere pacifist is to tear off the mask of preparedness propaganda, to expose its fallacy and its hypocrisy.

The way to end war is to end it. Until mankind in the mass has acquired sufficiently the instinct of self-preservation—an instinctive repulsion to this form of suicide; until millions of men instinctively react to the proposal of war as normal men today react to the proposal of individual murder, suicide, or incest; until one is no more respectable or thinkable than the other—the world will not be safe. So long as we allow business enterprises like the Chicago *Tribune* (and many others) to advocate, daily, arming against Japan or Mexico, to ferret out every provocative argument against foreign nations, to rattle journalistically the sword, we shall have war, whether the sentiment of the country is "reasonably" pacifist or not. The General Woodses and the Winston Churchills must be deported to some safe Arctic zone where they can indulge their *dementia bellicosa* harmlessly, instead of elevating one to be president of a university, the other to be colonial secretary. I am aware that such a revulsion of popular feeling about war and its advocates (including the timid devotees of preparedness) presupposes nothing less than a religious conversion. The movement must come from the hearts of the multitude, from the innumerable burden bearers of all wars, from the little, the unprivileged, the uncounted, from whom all real religious impulses have always come. To stir the hearts of these masses, so sorely

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wounded and betrayed, it will take something more than the arguments of the "reasonable pacifist": it will take the passion of the fanatic—and the real pacifist, convinced of the insanity of human suicide, must be something of a fanatic.

ROBERT HERRICK

Count Witte

The Memoirs of Count Witte. Translated from the original Russian Manuscript and edited by Abraham Yarmolinsky. Doubleday, Page and Company.

ONE puts down these memoirs with the strong impression that Count Witte was quite as anxious to pillory his enemies and all whom he did not like, and they were many, as he was to justify for posterity his own eventful public career. After all, the former aim was as natural as the latter, for Witte was a man of pronounced convictions, aggressive and stubborn manner, and downright likes and dislikes. Few statesmen have recorded more frankly their own opinions on public questions or commented more unsparingly upon the sins and shortcomings of their contemporaries. Alexander III, he tells us, "was the only man in whose presence I spoke my mind with complete unrestraint and with that bluntness which is rooted in my temperament." This "natural sharpness and looseness of speech" always stood between him and Nicholas II, who "in this respect, as in many others, . . . is the direct contrary of his most august father." Throughout the memoirs the criticism of Nicholas is severe, although at the same time entirely just. "The Emperor's character may be said to be essentially feminine. Someone has observed that Nature granted him masculine attributes by mistake. . . . His Majesty does not tolerate about his person anybody he considers more intelligent than himself or anybody with opinions differing from those of the court camarilla. . . . He is incapable of playing fair and he always seeks underhand means and underground ways." Yet Witte can speak of the Emperor as "the autocratic monarch of the Russian Empire, responsible for his deeds to God alone," and at the end of the last chapter but one can describe himself as "a sincere monarchist, as a loyal servant of the reigning House of the Romanovs, as a firm and devoted collaborator of the Emperor Nicholas II, and as a man profoundly attached to the Emperor and full of compassion for him."

Witte was himself a Russian noble, but his memoirs show little save contempt bordering upon hatred for the nobility of Russia as a class, notwithstanding his disclaimer that he entertains any such feeling. The majority of the nobility "is politically a mass of degenerate humanity, which recognizes nothing but the gratification of its selfish interests and lusts, and which seeks to obtain all manner of privileges and gratuities at the expense of the taxpayers generally, that is, chiefly the peasantry." Few of the Russian notables with whom he had to deal as members of the Government commanded his respect, and with many of them he was constantly at swords' points. Kuropatkin acted in Manchuria "with his customary flightiness and characteristic lack of foresight." The appointment of Alexeyev as commander-in-chief in the Russo-Japanese war "was the height of absurdity." Plehve "found in me an implacable opponent." The administration of Stolypin, bad as it was from any point of view, grows blacker than ever under Witte's pen. Crowned heads and dignitaries generally he weighed and found wanting. President Roosevelt, whom he met during the negotiation of the Treaty of Portsmouth, and whose luncheon at Oyster Bay affords the starting-point for a number of disparaging comments upon American cooking and domestic habits generally, impressed Witte as, like other American statesmen, ignorant of international politics. The rank of count which was bestowed upon Witte in recognition of his services at Portsmouth was given, he tells us, not only in spite of the personal dislike of the Emperor and the Empress, but also "in spite of all the base intrigues conducted against me by a host of bureaucrats and courtiers, whose vileness was only equaled by their stupidity." Nor does the Russian Church escape his condemnation. Witte was a devout man, and repeatedly turned to prayer in difficult moments; but he could also write: "Our church has unfortunately long since become a dead, bureaucratic institution, and our priests serve not the high God of lofty orthodoxy but the earthly gods of paganism. Gradually we are becoming less Christian than the members of any other Christian church."

There is small reason to doubt the truth of most of these bitter characterizations, and they are the more forcible because Witte, notwithstanding the political rottenness which he saw everywhere about him, remained a staunch monarchist and conservative. He could denounce the leaders of the Jew-baiting "Black Hundreds" as, for the most part, "unscrupulous political adventurers, with not a single practical and honest political idea," and with "all their efforts . . . directed toward goading and exploiting the low instincts of the mob"; and at the same time insist "that the abolition of Jewish disabilities must be gradual and as slow as possible." The grant of autonomy to the universities, which took place during his absence in America, seemed to him "one of those sudden, ill-calculated acts which characterized the fitful course of the Government's policy." He dreaded the approach of revolution, and prayed "that the change may come about bloodlessly and peacefully"; yet he felt sure that Russia would eventually have a constitutional government, and he could point with pride to the fact that, in spite of the October revolution, "throughout the six months of my premiership I did not enact a single extraordinary measure relating to the administration of St. Petersburg and its district," and that there was not "a single case of capital punishment."

Witte is not to be begrudged his dogmatism or his confidence, for he had, by the standards of his time, a great career. Coming to prominence first in the railway service, he was the reorganizer of the Russian railway system and the chief promoter of the Trans-Siberian Railway. He opposed the Russo-Japanese war and was under no illusions regarding the fateful consequences which the war would entail; but he fought skilfully and hard for Russia at Portsmouth and turned a military and naval defeat into something like a diplomatic victory. The Russian loan which he negotiated after the war, the largest foreign loan which any nation had contracted up to that time, enabled Russia to maintain the gold standard which he had introduced in 1896. He could claim a large share in preventing a clash between Germany and France over Morocco. But he could not overcome the ignorance and inertia of the Russian masses, or reform the aristocracy, or root out graft, or circumvent in the long run a monarch who lacked both intelligence and will; nor could he do anything to extricate Europe from the maze of alliances, understandings, and secret agreements which was leading straight to war. To most of these latter tasks, indeed, he seems never seriously to have set his hand. One wonders if, in the years of his virtual exile at least, he did not perceive that the Russian revolution which he dreaded was to come only with blood, and that he himself, in spite of all his efforts at reform, would be denounced as one of those who had done most to hold it back.

The English translation as a whole is well done, but there are a number of idiomatic infelicities which should have been got rid of. "Gouverneur" for private teacher (pp. 10, 26), "impossible to sleep of nights" (p. 39), "the Imperial appearance fenestral," meaning a leaning out from a window (p. 41), "sacred truths . . . were enounced" (p. 97), "several sharp explanations with the Minister" (p. 101), "built with the close participation of Admiral Makarov" (p. 105), "anticipating upon the course of events" (p. 28 and elsewhere), "perlustration of letters" (p. 179 and elsewhere), and "expediency" for expedition (p. 222), are the more conspicuous illustrations of faulty or unusual renderings. The index leaves a good deal to be desired.

WILLIAM MACDONALD

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fashions

Spicewood. By Lizette Woodworth Reese. Baltimore: The Norman, Remington Company.
Resurrecting Life. Michael Strange. Alfred A. Knopf.
A Canopic Jar. By Leonora Speyer. E. P. Dutton and Company.

OF these three ladies, each of whom dresses in a distinct poetic fashion, Miss Reese dresses in an old one and probably is proud of it. When Jessie B. Rittenhouse in 1904 wrote sketches of eighteen "Younger American Poets" she put Miss Reese in the second place as one who was mistress of a certain poignant primness, as one who was a feminine Robert Herrick. The quality implied in the comparison was debatable then and is more debatable now. Miss Reese's sonnets and quatrain-songs are impeccable in meter and phrasing, are irreproachable in sentiment; but they lack original salt. Their edges are frilled and lavendered, while their central designs are woven of gentle archaisms—"nowhit," "of a surety," "this many a year," "hushes where the lonely are," "all palely sweet," "candlelight," "wayfarer," "deem"—which Herrick did not or would not now employ. A little conscious archness in rhyme-words and ending-lines will not make up for a great monotony of neatness. Any poetical idea is new to the poet who makes it so; Miss Reese's are laced and ivoried over with unvarying, respectable age. Her book is not without charm, but it is without force.

Michael Strange's book is nothing if it is without force. Its author has risked everything for this—charm, tranquillity, clarity. The result is excitement in every line and force in almost none. The free verse foams like a fountain too zealously fed; adverbs do for phrases, dashes do for transitions. The theme is love, and the cant is psychology. There used to be a cant of the soul and the conscience which was very tiresome, but this of the nerves and the consciousness is no less so. For the bruised heart's pain we now have "agony bubbling hotly"; for the agitation of the poet's brain we have the muse "stirring my reactions . . . causing me to effervesce into expression"; for the searching of the soul we have

> the grinding gash of scruples
> Exploding inversely to the fore—
> Despite the bleating din of appalling infirmities arraigned
> Against the inquisitorial frown of ascending conscience.

One or two experiences are simply and vividly realized in the course of these eighty pages, but most lie buried beneath rank, artificial, behaviorist flowers, beneath ugly, pseudo-Freudian orchids.

Leonora Speyer falls somewhere between her two contemporaries, probably a little nearer the second than the first. She is free of the lavender and the lace, and she is superior to the psychology of the salon; she is simply and lucidly modern. She is brave when it comes to metaphors—reckless, indeed, nine times out of ten; but her intelligence can be depended on to rescue her eventually, and her energy conducts her most of the while through free verse that is not every day surpassed for decisive comment, clear conviction, and unexceptionable cadence.

> Spring, I am tired!
> Your brisk young buds and vigorous green
> And all the bustle of your clouds and winds
> But add to my great weariness;
> Ask the long grass how heavy falls my foot
> Across the excitement of the meadow.
>
> I pray you, still your restless sprigs and sprays
> And dancing leaves,
> Trying their newest steps on every bough and bush,
> And tell the birds to call their mates
> More modestly.

MARK VAN DOREN

Kansas

Dust. By Mr. and Mrs. Haldeman-Julius. Brentano's.
Folks. By Victor Murdock. The Macmillan Company.

"DUST" is a strong, spare, brief book. It is gray as granite, but through the stone runs a crimson vein of tragedy. The authors have probably lived among the "boomers" and "boosters," among those who have professionally represented the opening of the Mississippi Valley as one long romance and the personal lives of the pioneers as undeviatingly idyllic. Yet their book is no counter-blast; there is no word of polemics; the objectivity of vision is scrupulously observed. But there is the clearest seeing and the deepest probing.

The story concerns itself with one man and one woman who loom very large but never melt into symbols. Through them the land and its people and its history are seen. Thus all detail is highly concentrated and given in the shape of its psychological effects. There is no set description of scene either, but the sense of the prairie is pervasive and the Kansas dust comes finally to seem gritty between one's teeth. In this dust the pioneers themselves perished. Their son, Martin Wade, survived and prospered greatly. But the harsh necessity of wringing the land from the wilderness, and then the fertility from the land, leaves him, despite his energy and rough intelligence, a stunted creature, a slave of field and plow, barn and byre. He is rooted to the soil by pain, by a kind of hunger, by stubbornness, by love—by a sense of conflict and a deep sense of possession that grows out of conflict. He marries vaguely—marries poor Rose for companionship and cooking and the care of chickens and then with a blank, malignant unconsciousness wreaks vengeance on her because she never had any magic for him. He is a miser and a bully; he stints his wife and son cruelly to put the money into machinery and farm-buildings. He reduces her to premature decay and drives the boy to the coal-fields and so to his death. But he has starved his own nature with an equal fierceness. When he is far past fifty, beauty comes suddenly and breaks him and the unknown possibilities of life flood his heart. But it is, of course, too late. Dust is his portion. The farm even kills him before his time. Then a traction company sweeps the farm away and all his toil and poverty of soul have availed nothing. Rose is rich and old and free and futile and reflects vaguely on Martin's wasted life and death.

The book is profoundly honest and uncompromising. But it is quite without needless subtlety. The authors have so mastered and absorbed their material that they could project it by the starkest methods and in a few brief chapters. Its union of brevity and completeness makes "Dust" a notable contribution to the new fiction in America. It is forceful and exact, calm and luminous. It would come near being a little masterpiece if the diction itself were more sensitively selected and more finely tempered, if the stylistic workmanship were, in the most liberal and creative sense, more literary in character.

But the newspaper is, contrary to a common notion, a poor school of authorship. For if newspaper writing were as exact and sensitive as it is vague and blunted, newspapers would tell the truth. And what would become of our particular brand of civilization then? Thus Mr. Victor Murdock, Congressman from Kansas and once editor of the *Wichita Daily Eagle*, calmly writes and sees through the press the following: "The household had a library with current magazines in a reading-room. The furniture was uniform and of a style, and the few pictures on the walls evidenced the quality of having been selected rather than to have been accumulated." After that we are not surprised when Mr. Murdock calls Edison "the Wizard" and gives this inimitable description of a campaign oration of his idolized McKinley: "It was without humor, a wholesome, unimpassioned declaration of faith in a protective tariff, a reference to the Civil War ending with a stanza, and a tribute to his political party and its achievements." How marvelous to call a dec-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laration of faith in a protective tariff "wholesome"! Who does not yearn to know what stanza the unimpassioned orator quoted?

Mr. Murdock's sketches deal with the pioneer period in Kansas, the frontier life, the growth of Wichita. His memories are very full and varied and his observation of mere externals is shrewd enough. But the amusing and significant thing about his book and mind is that, in a deeper sense, he never permitted himself to observe at all. He merely used his eyes to discover what he believed a nice eye ought to see—pathetic gestures, homespun virtues, quaint, harmless follies, domestic sentiments, American faith and hope. Had he known Martin Wade he would have extolled the man's industry, zeal, prosperity, his wife's devotion to her husband, her chickens, her cows, the broad acres, the golden corn. Neither tragedy nor distinction enters his world. Roosevelt and Fairbanks visit a farm and talk about the price of bacon and the scarcity of tenderloins, the names of girl-babies and the question of hired help. Mr. Murdock's bosom swells at the thought that the great ones of earth are "just folks." Is it surprising that out of the Middle West come books with a touch of the cruel, the harsh, the bitter? Mr. William Allen White complained recently of the hard-heartedness of the younger novelists. Alas, only unsparing veracity can cleanse away these soft confusions and awaken a sense for the qualitative distinctions that make life civilized.

Upper Silesia

The Upper Silesian Question and Germany's Coal Problem. By Sidney Osborne. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.

MR. Osborne's book throws a new and much needed light on the vexed Upper Silesian problem, carefully surveying historic, economic, and political facts, bringing to light many aspects which have long been buried in propaganda, and presenting them all forcefully and convincingly. He reminds us that the only historic basis of Poland's claim to Upper Silesia is the fact that from 1000 to 1163 A.D. it was in Polish hands. In 1336 the King of Poland solemnly and unconditionally renounced all rights to Upper Silesia. In fact, Poland's claim dates back only to the discovery of coal there. Ever since the twelfth century Germans have been developing the resources of this territory, and it is owing to their science and labor that Upper Silesia is one of the richest spots in Europe today. Besides supplying Germany with machinery, textiles, one-fourth her coal, and many other commodities, it is a very important source of her agricultural products, thanks to the intensive cultivation of a rather unpromising soil. And since Germany provides Upper Silesia raw materials and a market for her goods, the economic interdependence of the two regions is unquestionable.

Perhaps the best proof of Germany's educational work in Upper Silesia is the fact that German is understood everywhere. It is claimed that most of the inhabitants are Polish by language, but Mr. Osborne shows us that Wasserpolnisch, the language spoken by the uneducated, which is a mixture of Polish and German, is so unlike Polish that when Polish agitators went to Upper Silesia to gain support among the people, they could not make themselves understood, and were forced to express themselves in German, which everyone understood. The schools and universities are German, and the comfortable conditions of the workers are distinctly typical of Germany in contrast to the practical serfdom which is the lot of Polish workers. Poland has shown no interest in the development of Upper Silesia, and practically none in its politics. Poland's need of its coal is insignificant, since only about one-seventh of Polish coal comes from Upper Silesia, and Poland's own mines have not been fully developed.

And so Mr. Osborne proceeds, knocking the bottom out of commonly accepted doctrines with his invaluable collection of authoritative data. The book is too detailed and dry in parts for the ordinary reader, and much of it is written in a clumsy style. By a better arrangement of the material, a good deal of repetition could be avoided. But the book is indispensable to any student of the Upper Silesian question.

Books in Brief

THE first English version of Baron Dr. von Schrenck Notzing's "Phenomena of Materialization" (Dutton) gives us the results of his experiments with the medium "Eva C.," carried on for four years in the realm of "subjective occurrences and mental mediumship." He recounts in detail the alleged "teleplastic phenomena," the appearance on many occasions of "vital efflorescences," proceeding from the body of the medium, "the production of white threads; clouds and mists; materials resembling muslin used for the clothing of the apparitions or of the medium [during transfiguration]; the appearance of forms of an undefined character; vague half-shadows; visible and tangible hands, fingers, and structures resembling human limbs; impressions of these on lamp-blacked paper, or in clay; photographic reproductions of ideoplastic forms in various stages of development, including those invisible to the normal human eye; sketches of artistic reproductions of faces, or fragments of animal and human limbs; and finally, fully formed phantoms of distinct character and definite features and forms." The author confesses that 54 per cent of the sittings were without result, but asks us to believe that in the other 46 per cent these repulsive manifestations really occurred. We are assured that every precaution was taken to prevent fraud, but are forced to conclude that either the Baron was basely deceived or that he is perpetrating a tremendous hoax upon us. The book has 225 illustrations, many of them his own alleged photographs of "spook" veils, hands, and phantoms. Hereward Carrington and others have shown exactly how excellent ghost-pictures may be made, giving extraordinary spectral effects. They have also made a complete exposure of materialization phenomena. Dr. Notzing claims that his searching examination of the medium at the beginning of each *séance* precluded all fraud accomplished by mechanical contrivances, but if the savants have been deceived for long periods by Eusapia Palladino and other clever mediums, is it not wholly probable that our author has also been deceived in his investigations?

"CICERO: A Biography" (University of California Press), by Thorsten Petersson, is a large, free book with which its large, free hero would be well pleased. The panorama of a great life which just missed being very great is amply, loosely spread before us, Cicero's own speeches and treatises and letters forming the principal basis of the narrative. The shortcomings of that many-sided man Mr. Petersson admits but does not expound; the many-sidedness itself, and the almost supreme virtue of wide-mindedness, he expounds without qualification. A statesman who was after all an orator, a philosopher who was after all an encyclopedist, a letter-writer who was after all more an intellect than a soul, Cicero lives in these pages to the extent that he can be made to live anywhere. The best chapters are the first four, filling in the ever amazing social and physical scene which Rome was in the first century B.C., and the last, setting forth with affection and dignity the fabled incidents of Cicero's magnificent death.

CICERO was a representative Roman in that he was incapable of an economic interpretation of history. That Rome indeed was incapable even of an economic policy has been evident to more than one generation of modern scholars, and is proved again in "An Economic History of Rome to the End of the Republic" (Johns Hopkins Press) by Tenney Frank. Mr. Frank has had to work with the meagerest of ancient materials—remarks by the way, inscriptions, letters, poems, coins, archaeo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

logical remains; for no Roman historian or orator ever wrote fully about land-holding or commerce while politics, intrigue, and ceremony existed to engage him. Mr. Frank, in addition to knowing the literature of his subject, is familiar at first hand with the geography and the soil of modern Rome, so that his chapters on agriculture are particularly crowded with information. His book as a whole, being based on monographs by himself in learned periodicals, is detailed and dry, but it is of permanent value.

A. G. GARDINER'S "The Anglo-American Future," listed in *The Nation's* Spring Book Supplement as an Oxford University Press book, is to be published in America by Thomas Seltzer.

Drama

"Liliom"

FRANZ MOLNAR'S "Liliom"—the "Roughneck"—presented by the Theater Guild at the Garrick illustrates with extraordinary force and freshness the plasticity of dramatic form. Instead of a play in three acts or four we have here a dramatic "legend in seven scenes and a prologue." To emphasize this matter of form is to recall, of course, the unteachableness of the human mind. Despite the theater of the Hindus, the Greeks, the medievals, the Elizabethans, the moderns, your average director, critic, playwright believes that the form of the drama is now immutably fixed. He has substituted a dead formula for a living reality and guards that formula with belligerent ardor. Therefore to us, at this moment, the very form of "Liliom" has a special and exhilarating charm.

That form was used in a tentative way by Hauptmann in "Elga." It was deliberately cultivated by Frank Wedekind from whose works the Hungarian Molnar undoubtedly derives it. It seeks to substitute an inner for an outer continuity, successive crises for a single one, and to blend chronicle with culmination. It takes the crests of the waves of life as the objects of its vision. The last wave merges into the indistinguishable sea. Film technique may be said to have influenced this form or even the chronicle method of Shakespeare. But it does not select its episodes to tell a story. They must unfold the inner fate of souls. In Wedekind and the expressionists the scenes are not only symbolical from the point of view of the entire action but also in their inner character, and little attempt is made to preserve the homely colors of life. What makes "Liliom" so attractive is that Molnar has avoided this extreme. He has used the expressionist structure and rhythm; the content of his scenes is beautifully faithful to the texture of reality.

Poor Liliom, barker for a merry-go-round in an amusement park, what is he but once more the eternal outcast, wanderer, unquiet one? He hasn't been taught a trade; he can't settle down as a care-taker; he isn't canny like the excellent Berkowitz. But he loves Julie. She weeps over his worthlessness and he strikes her—strikes her out of misery, to flee from self-abasement, to preserve some sort of superiority and so some liking for himself. She is to have a child and something cosmic and elemental tugs at the bully's heart. Are love and fatherhood only for the canny ones, the treaders in the mill, the hewers of wood? This is the conflict that destroys him. He is, viewed in another fashion, Everyman, and the little play, which has its shoddy, sentimental patches, is a sort of gay and rough and pitiful Divine Comedy. Liliom did not ask to be born with those imperious instincts into a tight, legalized, moral world. Society demands so much of him and gives him nothing wherewith to fulfil those demands. The world process has not even given him brains enough to think himself beyond demands and restrictions. He struggles with his body and nerves. His mind is docile. He believes that he is a sinner; he doesn't doubt that there are police courts in heaven as there are on earth, that there are cleansing, purgatorial fires, and a last chance, maybe, to be good. But neither the fires of hell nor his belief in them have power to change the essential character with which the implacable universe brought him forth. His notion of an expiatory action is to steal a star from the sky for his little daughter. He is Liliom still, and the joke is on the order with which man has sought to snare the wild cosmos. The joke is on a man-made world and a man-made heaven, because both that world and that heaven have used force. The joke is not on Julie. Julie has used love. "There are blows that don't hurt; oh, yes, there are blows that you don't feel." Love does not feel the blows. Love does not demand nor coerce nor imprison. Paradise is in the heart of love. For the sake of that ending you forgive Molnar the shoddy, sentimental little patches, for the sake of that moment which is beautiful, which is indeed great.

Among the many admirable productions of the Theater Guild that of "Liliom" may unhesitatingly be classed first. It is of a beautiful perfection. A scrupulous respect for reality is combined in it with a strong and sober imaginative sense. The first may be attributed to the direction of Mr. Frank Reicher. He was brought up in a school where veracity was understood and practiced as in no other period of theatrical history. The imaginative lift that the production has is largely due to Mr. Lee Simonson. Better than any other scenic artist among us he can convey the sense of out-of-doors, of the free air, of gardens and horizons. His spring really blooms, his autumn is russet and full of melancholy. His railroad embankment in the fourth scene is a triumph of the imaginative vision of reality, his "courtroom in the beyond" of an airy, restrained, compelling fancy.

The actors were assisted by the fact that the directors did not tamper with the play. Its folk-character is preserved and so its people retain their fine, concrete humanity. Thus, for instance, Miss Eva Le Gallienne, whose impersonations have hitherto been slight and faint and bloodless, is here transformed into a peasant girl, awkward and rude but full of the patience of a deep passion and the tenacity of a noble endurance. Mr. Joseph Schildkraut fulfilled all the expectations that were entertained of him. Once or twice he forced the note of stubborn impudence, as in his entrance into the infernal flames. But predominantly his Liliom is memorably racy, vivid, and exact. Miss Helen Westley surpasses all her recent performances in a part that demands not only harshness and verve but a bitter pathos and a wise relenting; and Mr. Dudley Digges, whose portrait of The Sparrow is a little masterpiece of sly rascality, heightens our sense of his flexibility and insight. And it would be ungrateful not to mention the no less excellent accomplishment in minor parts of Hortense Alden, Henry Travers, Edgar Stehli, and Albert Perry.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

A New Book
Denmark
A Co-operative Commonwealth
by
Frederic C. Howe
$1.69
R. H. Macy & Co. Inc.
Herald Square New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Russia's Treaties with Persia and Afghanistan

THE following full texts of Soviet Russia's treaties with Persia and Afghanistan are taken from the *Manchester Guardian* of March 31. The Persian treaty was signed in Moscow on February 26, and the Afghanistan treaty at the same place two days later.

Treaty Between Russia and Persia

The Government of Persia on the one side and the Government of the Russian Socialist Federate Soviet Republic on the other side, moved by the desire to establish for future time firm, good-neighborly, and brotherly relations between the Persian and Russian peoples, decided to enter upon negotiations with this object, for which purpose they appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The Government of Persia,

Ali-Guli-Khan Moshaverol Memalek.

The Government of the Russian Socialist Federate Soviet Republic,

Georgii Vasilievich Chicherin and

Lev Mikhailovich Karakhan.

The above-named plenipotentiaries, after mutual presentation of their credentials, which were found to be drawn up in proper form and due order, agreed as follows:

CLAUSE I

The Government of the R.S.F.S.R., in accordance with its declarations set forth in notes of January 14, 1918, and June 26, 1919, of the principles of the R.S.F.S.R.'s policy with regard to the Persian people, once more solemnly declares Russia's immutable renunciation of the policy of force with regard to Persia pursued by the Imperialist Governments of Russia that have been overthrown by the will of her workmen and peasants.

Accordingly, wishing to see the Persian people independent, flourishing, and freely controlling the whole of its own possessions, the Government of the R.S.F.S.R. declares all tractates, treaties, conventions, and agreements concluded by the late Czarist Government with Persia and tending to the diminution of the rights of the Persian people completely null and void.

CLAUSE II

The Government of the R.S.F.S.R. brands [as criminal] the policy of the Government of Czarist Russia, which, without the agreement of the peoples of Asia and under the guise of assuring the independence of these peoples, concluded with other states of Europe treaties concerning the East which had as their ultimate object its gradual seizure. The Government of the R.S.F.S.R. unconditionally rejects that criminal policy as not only violating the sovereignty of the states of Asia but also leading to organized brutal violence of European robbers on the living body of the peoples of the East.

Wherefore, and in accordance with the principles set out in Clauses I and IV of the present treaty, the Government of the R.S.F.S.R. declares its refusal to take part in any measures whatsoever tending to weaken or violate the sovereignty of Persia and declares completely null and void all conventions and agreements concluded by the late Government of Russia with third Powers for the harm of Persia and concerning her.

CLAUSE III

Both the High Treating Parties are agreed to recognize and observe the frontier between Persia and Russia in that form and outline in which it was established by the Frontier Commission of 1881. Moreover, the Government of the R.S.F.S.R., not wishing to enjoy the fruits of the rapacious policy of the late Czarist Government of Russia, resigns the use of the islands of Ashur Ada and the other islands lying along the coast of the Astrabad province of Persia, and further returns to Persia the village of Firuze and the land surrounding it, ceded by Persia to Russia according to the agreement of the 28th of May, 1893. The Government of Persia for its part agrees that the town of Seraks, known under the name of Russian or Old Seraks, with the adjoining district bounded by the river Seraks, remains in the possession of Russia.

Both the High Contracting Parties shall make use of the river Atrek and the other frontier rivers and waters on equal terms, and for the final regulation of the question of the usage of frontier waters and for the settling of all disputed frontier and territorial affairs in general a commission of representatives of Persia and Russia shall be appointed.

CLAUSE IV

Recognizing the right of each people to the free and unhindered settlement of its political fate, each of the High Contracting Parties disclaims and will strictly refrain from interference in the internal affairs of the other party.

CLAUSE V

Both the High Contracting Parties bind themselves:

1. Not to permit the formation or existence on their territory of organizations or groups, under whatever name, or of separate individuals, who have made it their object to struggle against Persia or Russia, and also against states allied with the latter, and similarly not to permit on their territory the recruiting or mobilization of persons for the armies or armed forces of such organizations.

2. To forbid those states or organizations, under whatever name, which make it their object to struggle against the other High Contracting Party, to bring into the territory or to take through the territory of each of the High Contracting Parties anything that may be used against the other High Contracting Party.

3. By all means at their disposal to prohibit the existence on their territory of the troops or armed forces of any third state whatsoever, the presence of which would constitute a threat to the frontiers, interests, or security of the other High Contracting Party.

CLAUSE VI

Both the High Contracting Parties are agreed that in case on the part of third countries there should be attempts by means of armed intervention to realize a rapacious policy on the territory of Persia or to turn the territory of Persia into a base for military action against the R.S.F.S.R., and if thereby danger should threaten the frontiers of the R.S.F.S.R. or those of Powers allied to it, and if the Persian Government after warning on the part of the Government of the R.S.F.S.R. should prove to be itself not strong enough to prevent this danger, the Government of the R.S.F.S.R. shall have the right to take its troops into Persian territory in order to take necessary military measures in the interests of self-defense. When the danger has been removed the Government of the R.S.F.S.R. promises immediately to withdraw its troops beyond the frontiers of Persia.

CLAUSE VII

In view of the fact that the combinations set out in Clause VI might similarly take place in relation to security on the Caspian Sea, both the High Contracting Parties are agreed that in case in the personnel of the ships of the Persian fleet there shall prove to be citizens of third Powers making use of their presence in the Persian fleet for purposes unfriendly with regard to the R.S.F.S.R., the Government of the R.S.F.S.R. shall have the right to demand from the Government of Persia the removal of the said harmful elements.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CLAUSE VIII

The Government of the R.S.F.S.R. declares its complete rejection of that financial policy which the Czarist Government of Russia pursued in the East, supplying the Government of Persia with financial means not in order to assist the economic development and flourishing of the Persian people, but in the form of a political enfetterment of Persia. The Government of the R.S.F.S.R. therefore resigns all rights to the loans furnished to Persia by the Czarist Government, and declares such loans null and not to be repaid. It similarly resigns all demands for the use of those state revenues of Persia by which the said loans were guaranteed.

CLAUSE IX

The Government of the R.S.F.S.R., in accordance with its expressed condemnation of the colonial policy of capitalism, which served and is serving as a reason for innumerable miseries and sheddings of blood, renounces the use of those financial undertakings of Czarist Russia which had as their object the economical enfetterment of Persia. It therefore hands over into the complete possession of the Persian people the financial sums, valuables, and in general, the assets and liabilities of the Discount Credit Bank of Persia, and similarly the movable and immovable property of the said Bank existing on the territory of Persia.

Note. The Government of Persia agrees, in each town where Russian Consular institutions shall be set up, and where there are houses belonging to the Discount Credit Bank of Persia, handed over to the Government of Persia according to this Clause IX, to provide for the gratuitous use of the Government of the R.S.F.S.R., one of such houses at the choice of the Soviet Government as a Russian Consular Institution.

CLAUSE X

The Government of the R.S.F.S.R. repudiates the tendency of world imperialism which strives to build in foreign countries roads and telegraph lines not so much for the cultural development of the peoples, as for insuring for itself the means of military penetration. In view of this, and wishing to provide the Persian people with the possibility of free disposal of the means of communication and correspondence, vitally necessary for the independence and cultural development of each people, and further, as far as it can, to compensate Persia for the losses caused her by the troops of the Czarist Government, the Government of the R.S.F.S.R. gratuitously hands over as the absolute property of the Russian people the following Russian erections [*sic*]:

(a) The *chaussées* Enzeli-Teheran and Kazvin-Hamadan with all the lands, buildings, and inventory attribute to these roads.

(b) The railways Djulfa-Tauris and Sofian-Lake Urmia, with all buildings, rolling stock, and other property.

(c) Quays, goods stores, steamers, barges, and other means of transport on Lake Urmia, with all attribute property.

(d) All the telegraph and telephone lines constructed by the late Czarist Government within the boundaries of Persia, together with all property, buildings, and inventory.

(e) The port of Enzeli, with the goods stores, electric power station, and other buildings.

CLAUSE XI

Proceeding from the consideration that, by virtue of the principles set out in Clause I of the present treaty, the peace tractate concluded between Persia and Russia in Turkmancha on the 10th of February, 1828, Clause 8 of which deprived Persia of the right to have a fleet on the Caspian Sea, has lost its force, both the High Contracting Parties are agreed that from the moment of the signing of the present treaty they shall equally enjoy the right of free navigation on the Caspian Sea under their own flags.

CLAUSE XII

The Government of the R.S.F.S.R. solemnly renouncing the enjoyment of economic privileges based on military predominance declares null and void also all other concessions besides those enumerated in Clauses 9 and 10 forced from the Government of Persia by the late Czarist Government for itself and its subjects. From the moment of the signing of the present treaty it returns to the Persian people in the person of the Government of Persia all the said concessions, carried out and not carried out alike, and all the portions of land received on the basis of these concessions. Of the lands and properties belonging in Persia to the late Czarist Government there remains in the possession of the R.S.F.S.R. the lands occupied by the Russian Mission in Teheran and in Zergende, with all the buildings and the property that is in them, and also the grounds, buildings, and property of the late Russian consulates general, consulates, and vice consulates in Persia.

Note. The Government of the R.S.F.S.R. renounces the right of ruling the village of Zergende, which belonged to the late Czarist Government.

CLAUSE XIII

The Government of Persia, on its part, promises not to hand over the concessions and property returned to Persia according to the present treaty to any third state or its citizens, in possession or for disposal or enjoyment, but to preserve the said rights to itself for the good of the Persian people.

CLAUSE XIV

Recognizing the whole significance of the fishing industries of the southern shores of the Caspian Sea for the normal supply of Russia with means of nourishment, the Government of Persia, on the expiration of the legal force of the treaty obligations which it has at present with regard to these industries, is willing to conclude an agreement with the proper organs of supply of the R.S.F.S.R. concerning the exploitation of these industries on special conditions which shall by that time have been worked out.

The Government of Persia similarly is ready to consider with the Government of the R.S.F.S.R. means which at the present time, before the above-mentioned conditions come about, should be capable of insuring the organs of supply of the R.S.F.S.R. the possibility of supplying Russia from the said fishing industries.

CLAUSE XV

The Government of the R.S.F.S.R., proceeding from the principle it has proclaimed, of the freedom of religious faiths, wishes to put an end to the missionary religious propaganda in the countries of Islam, which had as its secret object action on the popular masses and supported in this way the rapacious intrigues of Czarism. It therefore declares all those religious missions closed which were established in Persia by the late Czarist Government, and will take measures to prohibit in future the sending of such missions into Persia.

The lands, buildings, and properties of the Orthodox Religious Mission in Urmia, and similarly all the property of other institutions of this kind, the Government of the R.S.F.S.R. gratuitously hands over into the perpetual possession of the Persian people in the person of the Government of Persia.

The Government of Persia will make use of the said lands, buildings, and property for the establishment of schools and other cultural educational institutions.

CLAUSE XVI

In accordance with the regulation set out in the note of the Soviet Government of the 26th of June, 1919, concerning the abolition of Russian consular jurisdiction, Russian citizens living in Persia, and similarly Persian citizens living in Russia, will from the moment of the signing of the present treaty enjoy equal rights with local citizens, and will be subject to the laws of the country in which they are. All their affairs of justice will be considered in the local institutions of justice.

CLAUSE XVII

Persian citizens in Russia, and similarly Russian citizens in Persia, are exempted from military service and from the paying of any military taxes or contributions whatever.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CLAUSE XVIII

With regard to the right of free circulation inside the country, Persian citizens in Russia and Russian citizens in Persia will enjoy the rights given to the citizens of the most favored Power, other than those allied with Russia.

CLAUSE XIX

Both the High Contracting Parties in the shortest time after the signing of the present treaty will set about the renewal of trade relations. The means of organizing import and export of goods and payment for them and similarly the order of collecting and the amounts of customs duties set by Persia on Russian goods shall be defined by a special trade convention, which shall be worked out by a special commission of representatives of both parties.

CLAUSE XX

Both the High Contracting Parties mutually give each other the right of transit of goods through Persia or through Russia into a third country, and further goods taken through must not be taxed with a duty larger than that on the goods of the most favored nation.

CLAUSE XXI

Both the High Contracting Parties in the shortest time after the signing of the present treaty will set about the renewal of telegraphic and postal relations between Persia and Russia. The conditions of these relations shall be defined in a special telegraphic convention.

CLAUSE XXII

With the object of supporting the good-neighborly relations established with the signing of the present treaty and for the strengthening of good mutual understanding, each of the High Contracting Parties shall be represented in the capital of the other party by a plenipotentiary representative, enjoying in Persia as in the R.S.F.S.R. the right of exterritoriality and other prerogatives, according to international law and customs, and according to the rules current in both countries with regard to diplomatic representatives.

CLAUSE XXIII

Both the High Contracting Parties, with the object of developing relations between their countries, shall mutually establish consulates at points which shall be settled by mutual agreement. The rights and competencies of consuls shall be defined by a consular convention, to be concluded immediately after the signing of the present treaty, and also the laws and rules current in both countries with regard to consular institutions.

CLAUSE XXIV

The present treaty is subject to ratification within three months. Ratifications shall be exchanged as soon as possible.

CLAUSE XXV

The present treaty is drawn up in the Persian and Russian languages in two original examples. In interpretation both texts shall be accounted authentic.

CLAUSE XXVI

The present treaty comes into force immediately on its signature.

In confirmation of which the undersigning have signed the present treaty and affixed their seals to it.

Drawn up in Moscow 26th February, 1921.

G. CHICHERIN
L. KARAKHAN
MOSHAVEROL MEMALEK

Treaty Between Russia and Afghanistan

With a view to strengthening friendly relations between Russia and Afghanistan, and with a view to confirming the actual independence of Afghanistan, the Russian Socialist Federate Soviet Republic on the one side and the Sovereign State of Afghanistan on the other, decided to conclude the present treaty, for which purpose they appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The Government of the Russian Socialist Federate Soviet Republic,

Georgii Vasilievich Chicherin,
Lev Mikhailovich Karakhan,

and the Government of the Sovereign State of Afghanistan,

Muhammed Valy Khan,
Mirza Muhammed Khan,
Hulyam Sidluik Khan.

The above-named plenipotentiaries, after mutual presentation of their credentials, which were found to be in due form and order, agreed as follows:

CLAUSE I

The High Contracting Parties, recognizing their mutual independence and promising to respect it, mutually enter into regular diplomatic relations.

CLAUSE II

The High Contracting Parties bind themselves not to enter with any third State into a military or political agreement which would damage one of the Contracting Parties.

CLAUSE III

Legations and consulates of the High Contracting Parties will mutually and equally enjoy diplomatic privileges in accordance with the customs of international law.

Note I. Including:

(a) The right to hoist the state flag.

(b) Personal inviolability of the registered members of legations and consulates.

(c) Inviolability of diplomatic correspondence and of persons fulfilling the duties of couriers and every kind of mutual assistance in these matters.

(d) Communication by radio, telephone, and telegraph, in accordance with the privileges of diplomatic representatives.

(e) Exterritoriality of buildings occupied by legations and consulates, but without the right of giving asylum to persons whom the local Government officially recognizes as having broken the laws of the country.

Note II:

The military agents of both contracting parties shall be attached to their legations on a basis of parity.

CLAUSE IV

The High Contracting Parties mutually agree upon the opening of five consulates of the Russian Socialist Federate Soviet Republic on Afghan territory and seven consulates of Afghanistan on Russian territory, of which five are to be within the boundaries of Russian Central Asia.

Note. Over and above these the opening of further consulates and consular points in Russia and Afghanistan shall be defined in each particular case by special agreement between the High Contracting Parties.

CLAUSE V

Russian consulates shall be established in Herat, Meimen, Mazar-i-Sherif, Kandahar, and Gazn. Afghan consulates shall be established: a consulate general in Tashkent and consulates in Petrograd, Kazan, Samarkan, Merv, and Krasnovodsk.

Note. The order and time of the actual opening of the Russian consulates in Afghanistan and of the Afghan consulates in Russia shall be defined by special agreement between the two Contracting Parties.

CLAUSE VI

Russia agrees upon the free and untaxed transit through her territory of every kind of goods bought by Afghanistan either in Russia herself, through the state organs, or directly from abroad.

CLAUSE VII

The High Contracting Parties agree upon the freedom of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Outlook

London's Leading Weekly Review

EDITED BY

JOHN L. BALDERSTON

The new outlook has no politics and takes no hand in parochial local disputes. Our vision stretches across the Atlantic—problems of the Pacific as well as the welter in old Europe are dealt with in no narrow spirit. American readers will find in our pages the fairest, sanest, most able pleading, not for Lloyd George's bureaucracy of "hard faced men," not for the idees fixes of Radical faddists, but for the views and ideals of new and young England.

Signed articles each week by the best of the younger men on Literature, Drama, Music and Art. Our regular contributors include J. C. SQUIRE and E. T. RAYMOND.

Five dollars a year—introductory subscription for three months one dollar. Send check in dollars on your own bank, or cash—don't bother with drafts or postal orders.

The Outlook

1, TUDOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

RITES OF THE TWICE BORN
By MRS. SINCLAIR STEVENSON *Net* $10.50
A remarkable book dealing with Brahman ritual which is permeated with innumerable superstitions and primitive usages.

RES METRICA
By W. R. HARDIE $3.40
A valuable introduction to the study of Greek and Roman versification for every student of poetic meter.

THE STORY OF MY LIFE
By COL. PHILLIP MEADOWS TAYLOR $7.20
The autobiography of a romantic and adventurous character of the greatest interest to students of Indian matters.

THE WAYS OF LIFE
By STEPHEN WARD *Net* $2.00
A study in ethics dealing with the whole of life written in admirable English. An original work of the greatest interest.

At all booksellers or from the publishers.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
American Branch
35 WEST 32ND ST., NEW YORK

May, 1821—May, 1921

A GREAT CENTURY

is completed this week by the MANCHESTER GUARDIAN, which is receiving the congratulations of its contemporaries and of public men in all countries.

More fully today than at any previous stage of its unique history is it the voice of the enlightened groups in England.

The Manchester Guardian Weekly

is the indispensable paper for the American citizen with an alert interest in the affairs of the world.

Bright and accurate News; brilliant Special Correspondence; the broadest and sanest Editorial Comment; articles by eminent pens on Books, Drama, Music, Commerce, and Sport.

.....Mail coupon below.....

To THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN,
Dept. N. 2001, 220 West 42d Street, New York.

I enclose three dollars for a year's subscription to THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN WEEKLY, to be mailed to me direct from Manchester, England, commencing with the current issue.

Name.....

Address.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eastern nations on the principle of independence and in accordance with the general wish of each nation.

CLAUSE VIII

In confirmation of Clause 7 of the present treaty, the High Contracting Parties agree upon the actual independence and freedom of Bokhara and Khiva, whatever may be the form of their government, in accordance with the wish of their peoples.

CLAUSE IX

In fulfilment of and in accordance with the promise of the Russian Socialist Federate Soviet Republic, expressed by its head, Lenin, to the Minister Plenipotentiary of the Sovereign State of Afghanistan, Russia agrees to hand over to Afghanistan the frontier districts which belonged to her in last century, observing the principle of justice and the free expression of the will of the people. The order of the expression of the free will and the expression of the opinion of the majority of the regular local population shall be regulated in a special treaty between the two states through the plenipotentiaries of both sides.

CLAUSE X

In order to strengthen the friendly mutual relations between the High Contracting Parties the Government of the Russian Socialist Federate Soviet Republic agrees to give to Afghanistan financial and other help.

CLAUSE XI

The present treaty is drawn up in the Russian and Persian languages and both texts are accounted authentic.

CLAUSE XII

The present treaty becomes valid after its ratification by the Governments of the High Contracting Parties. The exchange of ratifications shall take place in Kabul, in confirmation of which the plenipotentiaries of both sides signed the present treaty and set their seals to it.

Drawn up in Moscow on the 28th of February, 1921.

SUPPLEMENTARY CLAUSE

In development of Clause 10 of the present treaty the Government of the Russian Socialist Federate Soviet Republic gives to the Sovereign State of Afghanistan the following help:

1. Yearly free subsidy to the extent of one million rubles in gold or silver in coin or bullion.
2. Construction of a telegraph line—Kushka-Herat-Kandahar-Kabul.
3. Over and above this the Government of the Russian Socialist Federate Soviet Republic expresses its readiness to place at the disposal of the Afghan Government technical and other specialists.

This help the Government of the Russian Socialist Federate Soviet Republic shall afford to the Government of the Sovereign State of Afghanistan within two months after the present treaty becomes valid.

The present supplementary clause has equal legal validity with the other clauses of the present treaty.

Moscow, the 28th of February, 1921.

In the forthcoming issue of *The Nation* John Kane Mills, a writer on economics and an authority on international finance, will contribute an important article, entitled Would the Use of Gold Bring Down the Cost of Living?

Hotel St. Regis
Fifth Avenue and Fifty-fifth Street
New York

Concentration of the most distinguished of America

WEDDINGS, RECEPTIONS, DANCES, PRIVATE DINNERS—

Are Now Being Booked for the Coming Season

R. M. HAAN

Practically immediate relief of pain follows a dose of

Midol

It is equally efficacious for
HEADACHE
TOOTHACHE
NEURALGIA

—and in addition to being absolutely safe to take
—it has no undesirable after effects.

In aluminum boxes
2 sizes. At all druggists

General Drug Co.
94 N. Moore Street, New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED